

be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to succeed William H. Sawtelle, deceased.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky, to succeed James H. Hammons, term expired.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, reported favorably the nomination of Robert D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, to be Archivist of the United States, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar is in order.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles T. Fisher, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, information reached me a few moments ago through the assistant secretary of the minority, Mr. Foster, that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] could not be present at this time, and asked that the nomination go over for the day. I make this statement because the information reached me only a short time ago.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I assume it is reasonable to ask for one further day's delay in the consideration if any Senator seeks it, but I should like to give notice that I shall resist any further effort to postpone action on the nomination, because there is not one reason on earth why it should not be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request of the Senator from Oregon, the nomination will go over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

CLIFTON MATHEWS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was instructed this morning by the Judiciary Committee to report favorably the nomination of Clifton Mathews, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to succeed William H. Sawtelle, deceased. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is a member of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary which passed upon the nomination. It is a unanimous report, and there is no objection. Judge Sawtelle died some time ago, and there is a vacancy which ought to be filled promptly.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, did the committee act on the nomination favorably?

Mr. KING. Yes; the committee acted upon it favorably today. It was referred to the subcommittee last week and the subcommittee considered it very fully. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not think anything has been said by the Senator from Utah that would indicate an emergency. In view of that situation I think the nomination should go over.

Mr. KING. Very well; I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, it is now my purpose to move a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, but I wish to give notice that hereafter I am going to ask the Senate to remain in session until a reasonably late hour and try to dispose of the amendments to the joint resolution. I shall ask the Senate to remain in session until at least 6 o'clock, and possibly later.

I now move, as in legislative session, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

SOLICITOR GENERAL

Stanley Reed, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor General, vice James Crawford Biggs, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Author M. Steele, Gentry.
Will A. Bostick, Van Buren.

KENTUCKY

William T. Carlin, Buechel.
Ruby V. Vaughn, Clay.
John A. Goodman, Elkton.
Joe R. Richardson, Glasgow.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Kroc, Alanson.
Henry W. Boyle, Bark River.
Mayme Arnestad, Marenisco.
John C. Vaughan, Trout Creek.

NEBRASKA

John F. McGill, Center.
George J. Scott, Crawford.
Albert J. Nacke, Hebron.
George D. Parker, Johnson.
Herman Stahly, Milford.
Mable A. Foreman, Palmyra.
Charles J. Mullaney, Walthill.

NEW YORK

Glen H. Smith, Mexico.

TEXAS

James C. Erwin, Alto.
Luther G. Porter, Bangs.
Albert P. Hinton, Columbus.
Anton C. Mussil, Granger.
Fred M. Carrington, Marquez.
Robert H. Patterson, Mullin.

VERMONT

Daniel P. Healy, White River Junction.

WASHINGTON

Fred E. Booth, Castle Rock.
Edith M. Lindgren, Cosmopolis.
Lonnie L. Grant, Langley.
Leonard McCleary, McCleary.
Leon L. Stock, Marysville.
Peyton B. Hoover, Rochester.
Raymond M. Badger, Winthrop.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, Thou hast again opened Thine hand and showered blessings upon us. We pray that we may show our gratitude to Thee by serving wisely and lovingly our country and our homes. By the breath of Heaven and the currents of earth, forever hold us

from the cruel sin of ingratitude, which wrings suffering hearts and freezes the finest emotions of the human breast. Blessed Lord, keep our faith in men undimmed, and may we pour into them the spirit of a conquering life, which is the supreme chivalry of earth. Heavenly Father, be merciful to deliver us from the misunderstandings, the misrepresentations, and the exasperations which poison life. Give to all who thus suffer, beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Guide all who wander; give certitude to the oppressed and help to all who are perplexed. O let love do its perfect work, and Thine shall be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1935, was read and approved.

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 107, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

This is a matter in which at least 75 Members of the House are interested and there is no opposition that I know of, and I hope there will be no objection to this request.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, from what committee does this joint resolution come?

The SPEAKER. From the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is on the Consent Calendar, which is to be called this afternoon, and while I am in favor of the bill—

Mr. SNELL. I think I am, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not think this unusual procedure should be followed. A large number of people are in favor of the measure, and if it is not reached on the call of the Consent Calendar this afternoon I would be in favor of one of the advocates of the bill calling it up before we adjourn tonight. There are a number of people who have worked on this bill for years around here, but I do not think this unusual procedure should be followed.

Mr. PETTENGILL. It will only take 2 or 3 minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. SNELL. If we start this procedure we will have to follow it for some other request.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would call attention to the fact there is legislation pending making Armistice Day, November 11, a proper holiday, and I see no reason why this measure should take precedence over that one. I think we should pass legislation declaring November 11 a proper holiday.

Mr. PETTENGILL. I will go along with the gentleman. The gentleman and I can agree very nicely about that.

Mr. McFARLANE. I see no reason why this measure should go ahead of that one.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this matter has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and by what authority has he submitted this request?

Mr. PETTENGILL. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, but in two previous Congresses I have moved the adoption of a similar resolution. This is a duplicate of a bill of my own. The one on the calendar is that of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CITRON], and I am calling up his bill with his approval.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. I may say that this procedure has not been authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been reported out and there is also a measure to celebrate Leif Ericson Day and five or six more bills of a similar character.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for this celebration for 1 year. A similar bill was passed in the last Congress for last year. If we are going to continue this custom, why not make

all these occasions national holidays and have the flag up all the time, rather than just passing a bill each year the purpose of which is political in character? I think if the matter is worthy of being brought up and being made permanent, that is one thing, but I do object to bringing up these bills each year for political effect. If we are going to bring them up for political effect, let us bring them up just in the election years; or if it is proper in all years, let us make it permanent. I do not want to object, but I want the House to think about this.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to know what we are trying to do here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk has reported.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is this bill on the Consent Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Why take up any measures on the Consent Calendar out of order? Under a reservation of the right to object, I would like to submit this question to the gentleman.

Mr. PETTENGILL. If I may say so, a number of Members who are interested in this particular resolution want to be on the floor at the time it is brought up and I asked the Speaker if he would recognize me at this time and we have notified these Members to be present, so far as we could, and that is the reason for the request at this time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, will this joint resolution be in order at the end of the day after the disposition of the cotton bill?

The SPEAKER. If the Consent Calendar is reached, it will be in order when reached on that calendar, and it will also be in order at any time during the day for the gentleman to renew his request.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to work any hardship on anybody here and if there is any special reason why this matter should come up out of order I shall withdraw my objection, but my position, as one who defends the Consent Calendar on this side, is that I think these things should come up in their order. This bill is on the calendar and so far as I know on our side there is no objection to it, and my only purpose in objecting is to protest the consideration of the calendar in the regular way.

Mr. PETTENGILL. The gentleman, perhaps, has not been receiving the large number of telegrams that others have received from Polish-American organizations all over the United States trying to get this measure disposed of today.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute to explain in advance the unanimous-consent request I am going to prefer after the minute expires. It is to take up a bill to confer the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, who 1 week from tomorrow will be 91 years old.

That bill is on the Private Calendar and therefore cannot be put on the Consent Calendar, and we wish the bill to pass the House today. I believe it can be passed by the Senate tomorrow, and I have the assurance of the floor leader of the Senate that he will be glad to try to pass it, with the Senate's consent, and it can be passed and approved by the President by the ninety-first birthday of that grand old hero who first

explored the Arctic regions, and present him with the medal of honor so long past due.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely be taken up for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SNELL. As I understand from the reading of the bill, it does not carry any provision giving him the privileges of the floor—and probably a man 91 years old would not exercise that privilege. But it is the principle that I am interested in.

Mr. McSWAIN. I beg to assure the gentleman that I have investigated the rule and this does not confer the thanks of Congress, but simply confers the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I was wondering why this bill, if on the Consent Calendar, should be taken up at this time.

Mr. McSWAIN. It is not on the Consent Calendar, and cannot be, because it is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing in this bill. General Greely is a native of Massachusetts and a noted explorer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, United States Army, retired, for his life of splendid public service, begun on March 27, 1844, having enlisted as a private in the United States Army on July 26, 1861, and by successive promotions was commissioned as major general February 10, 1906, and retired by operation of law on his sixty-fourth birthday.

Under leave to extend his remarks, Mr. McSWAIN offers the report of the Committee on Military Affairs on H. R. 5322, for printing in the RECORD, giving detailed information concerning the public services of General Greely:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass.

The following is a statement of the military service of Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 28, 1935.

STATEMENT OF THE MILITARY SERVICE OF ADOLPHUS WASHINGTON
GREELY

Born in Newburyport, Mass., March 27, 1844. Appointed from Louisiana, private, corporal, and first sergeant, Company B, Nineteenth Massachusetts Infantry, July 26, 1861, to March 18, 1863; second lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, March 18, 1863; first lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, April 14, 1864; captain, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, March 26, 1865; honorably mustered out, March 22, 1867; second lieutenant, Thirty-sixth United States Infantry, March 7, 1867; accepted, May 20, 1867; unassigned, May 19, 1869; transferred to Fifth Cavalry, July 14, 1869; first lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, May 27, 1873; captain, June 11, 1886; brigadier general, Chief Signal Officer, March 3, 1887; accepted, March 8, 1887; major general, February 10, 1906; accepted, February 10, 1906; retired, March 27, 1908. (By operation of law, sec. 1, act June 30, 1882.)

VOLUNTEER RECORD

He entered the service as a private in Company B, Nineteenth Massachusetts Infantry, July 26, 1861; was promoted corporal, May 15, 1862, and first sergeant, January 1, 1863.

He served with his regiment in the Army of the Potomac until wounded at the Battle of Antietam, Md., September 17, 1862; was absent on account of wound to November 1862, and with his regiment to March 18, 1863, when he was mustered in as second lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Troops; was promoted first lieutenant, April 26, 1864, and captain, April 4, 1865.

He received the brevet of major of Volunteers March 13, 1865, "for faithful and meritorious services during the war."

He served with his regiment, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, in the Department of the Gulf (being on sick leave from

Oct. 6 to Nov. 15, 1864) until his muster out of service, November 30, 1866, and was then retained in service on detached duty in New Orleans, La., to March 22, 1867, when honorably mustered out.

REGULAR ARMY SERVICE

He joined his company August 7, 1867, and served with it at Fort Bridger, Wyo., from August 7, 1867, to November 1867, and at Fort Douglas, Utah, to October 8, 1868; was on duty as Acting Signal Officer, in the office of the Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., to March 29, 1869, and as Chief Signal Officer, Department of the Platte, to March 8, 1871. He joined the Fifth Cavalry March 15, 1871, and served with it at Fort Laramie, Wyo., to July 15, 1871. He was on duty in the office of the Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., from July 29, 1871, to June 19, 1881. While on this assignment he was absent on signal duty, tours of inspection, etc., as follows: February 17 to November 19, 1873; December 1, 1873, to August 25, 1874; September 28 to December 2, 1874; December 3, 1874, to March 13, 1875; in charge of military telegraph line, Denison, Tex., March 26, 1875, to May 24, 1876, and on leave of absence to November 24, 1876; February 5, 1877, to January 1878; at St. Paul, Minn., and Bismarck, Dakota Territory, June 6, 1878, to January 6, 1879. He commanded the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition from June 20, 1881, sailing from St. Johns, Newfoundland, July 4, until rescued by the expedition under the command of Captain Schley, United States Navy, near Cape Sabine, June 22, 1884; landed at St. Johns, Newfoundland, July 17, 1884; on temporary duty at Portsmouth, N. H., August 1 to October 6, 1884, and was on sick leave to November 22, 1884, when he returned to duty in the office, Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., where he served until December 13, 1886; in charge of the office of the Chief Signal Officer, to March 7, 1887; Chief Signal Officer and in charge of War Department library, March 8, 1887, to February 10, 1906, being on various occasions on detached service abroad. He visited Cuba March 25 to April 11, 1899; attended a meeting of the National Geographic Society at Berlin, Germany, September 14 to October 14, 1899; in the Philippine Islands, Japan, England, and France, on special service, May 24 to November 7, 1901; Alaska, in connection with Alaska cable, June 27 to August 15, 1902; in London, England, attending International Telegraphic Congress, May 12 to June 14, 1903; Berlin, Germany, Conference on Wireless Telegraphy, July 22 to August 29, 1903; in Alaska and Ottawa, Canada, June 14 to August 15, 1904; Berlin, Germany, on public business, August 20 to September 7, 1904.

He was frequently on detached service to various points in the United States in connection with the duties of his office, the installation of electrical equipment for the use of the Army, and the laying of cables.

Following his appointment as a major general, he was on special duty in the office of the Chief of Staff to February 13, 1906; commanding the Division of the Pacific March 9, 1906, to (temporarily commanding the Department of Columbia, July 24 to Aug. 3, 1906, and the Department of California, July 26 to Aug. 2, 1906) August 7, 1906; on leave of absence to September 9, 1906; commanding the Northern Division at St. Louis, Mo., from September 16, 1906, to (temporarily commanding Department of Dakota, Sept. 16 to Oct. 2, 1906; Department of Missouri, Oct. 3-29, 1906; Department of Missouri, Dec. 5, 1906, to May 21, 1907) November 13, 1906. He was in charge of the relief work of the Army following the San Francisco earthquake after April 22, 1906. He was in command of the Northern Division, Chicago, Ill., to July 7, 1907; Vancouver Barracks, Wash., commanding Department of Columbia, to December 10, 1907; St. Paul, Minn., commanding the Department of Dakota, December 11-24, 1907; on leave of absence from December 25, 1907, to the date of his retirement.

He was designated to represent the War Department to assist His Excellency John Hays Hammond, Ambassador Extraordinary, at the coronation of King George V of England, in June 1911.

General Greely was awarded the Purple Heart with oak-leaf cluster on account of wounds received in action June 30, 1862, at Battle of Glendale, Va., and September 17, 1862, at Battle of Antietam, Md., while serving as a corporal, Company B, Nineteenth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. Silver Coronation Medal of Great Britain, 1911.

General Greely is still on the retired list of the Army. Latest address, 3131 O Street NW., Washington, D. C.

By authority of the Secretary of War:

[SEAL]

JAMES F. MCKINLEY,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

The following concerning Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely is taken from *Who's Who in America*, 1934-35, volume 18:

"Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, United States Army; born, Newburyport, Mass., March 27, 1844; son of John Balch and Frances (Cobb) Greely; graduated Newburyport High School, 1860; married Henrietta H. C. Nesmith, June 20, 1878; children—Antoinette, Adola, John Nesmith, Rose Ishbel, Adolphus W., Gertrude Gale. Served in Civil War, 1861-65, private to captain, and received the brevet of major of volunteers (thrice wounded); appointed second lieutenant, Thirty-sixth United States Infantry, March 7, 1867; first lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, May 27, 1873; captain, June 11, 1886; brigadier general, Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, March 3, 1887; major general, February 10, 1906. First volunteer private soldier of Civil War to reach grade of brigadier general, United States Army. Constructed 2,000 miles military telegraph in Texas, Dakota, and Montana, 1876-79; in pursuance of recommendation of Hamburg International Geographical Congress (1879) was placed, 1881, in command of United States expedi-

tion to establish 1 of a chain of 13 circumpolar stations; his party of 25 reached farther north (83°24') than any previous record; discovered new land north of Greenland and crossed Grinnell Land to the Polar Sea; 2 relief expeditions failed to reach the party, which retreated south to Cape Sabine, where, relief still failing, the party largely perished of starvation, only 7 survivors being found by third expedition under Capt. Winfield S. Schley.

"During military operations abroad (1898-1902) there were built and operated under his direction 1,000 miles of telegraph in Puerto Rico, 3,800 miles in Cuba, 250 miles in China, and 13,500 miles of lines and cables in Philippine Islands; installed system of 3,900 miles of telegraph lines, submarine cables, and wireless in Alaska, 1900, 1904, the wireless section of 107 miles, from Nome to St. Michael, being the first successful long-distance wireless operated regularly as part of a commercial system. Member of board to regulate wireless telegraphy in United States, 1904; member of board to report on coast defenses of United States, 1905; United States delegate to International Telegraph Conference, London, 1903; and International Wireless Telegraph Conference, Berlin, 1903. Commanding Pacific Division and in charge relief operations, San Francisco earthquake sufferers, April-August 1906; commanding Northern Division, 1906; Department of Columbia, 1907; retired by operation of law, 1908. Gold medalist, Royal, American, and French Geographic Societies.

"Author of *Isothermal Lines of the United States*, 1881; *Chronological List of Auroras*, 1881; *Diurnal Fluctuations of Barometric Pressure*, 1891; *Three Years of Arctic Service*, two volumes, 1885; *Proceedings of Lady Franklin Bay Expedition*, 1888; *American Weather*, 1890; *American Explorers*, 1894; *Handbook of Arctic Discoveries*, 1896; *Rainfall of Western States and Territories*, 1888; *Climate of Oregon and Washington*, 1889; *Climate of Nebraska*, 1890; *Climatology of Arid Region*, 1891; *Climate of Texas*, 1891; *Public Documents First Fourteen Congresses of United States*, 1900; *Handbook of Polar Discoveries*, 1909; *Handbook of Alaska*, 1925; *True Tales of Arctic Heroism*, 1912; *Reminiscences of Travel and Adventure*, 1927; *Polar Regions in Twentieth Century*, 1928; *Representative United States of America at Coronation of George V of England*, 1911.

"Address, Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McSWAIN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF WORLD WAR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. O'CONNOR, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following rule, which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered printed:

House Resolution 165

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3896, "A bill to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes"; and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 10 hours, to be evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as substitute amendments for the bill any such amendments that relate to the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, and such substitute amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except two motions to recommit, with or without instructions: *Provided, however*, That if the instructions in such motions relate to the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, they shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

WE THE PEOPLE

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address which I made at Martinsburg, W. Va., to the Old Hickory Club on the anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at Martinsburg, W. Va., March 15, 1935, before the Old Hickory Club, on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson at the annual Jackson Day dinner:

Richard Henry Lee made a motion that the Colonies declare their independence. Thomas Jefferson reduced that motion to writing, which is now a venerable document, and Gen. George Washington and the colonial troops made it effective.

The Revolution itself was a democratic movement. Its controlling motive was stimulated by democratic ideas. All of the typical Revolutionary utterances breathe throughout the spirit of democracy. This spirit is the essential and living element in the Declaration of Independence.

Then there came the Constitutional Convention, and from it the Constitution. In the very first words of that great document we see the influence of this formulating, crystallizing democracy. How does the preamble begin? Being the supreme law of the land, it must begin by naming the authority from whence it came. Since all just power comes from the consent of the governed, the preamble to the Constitution begins by naming this fountainhead from which power emanates. It begins with these thrilling words of democracy: "We, the people * * *"—"We, the people of the United States * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution."

Not George Washington, not Benjamin Franklin, not Alexander Hamilton, but "We, the people."

It was not "I, the king", nor "I, the prince", nor "I, the czar", nor, "I, the mikado", nor "I, the emperor", but "We, the people."

At the beginning of Washington's administration the wealthy, aristocratic classes were in control. Alexander Hamilton, a Federalist, was Secretary of the Treasury. He set to work to establish a moneyed aristocracy as the permanent ally of the Government.

This tendency of the new government toward a plutocracy crystallized the opposition, thus unifying the Democratic feeling throughout the States, thereby formulating the national Democratic Party. The leader and founder of this new party was Thomas Jefferson.

This Democratic wave spread rapidly through the States. Opposition to the aristocratic principles of the Federalists, who were the Republicans of that day, increased. Hamilton wanted to make a great imperialistic nation of pomp and glory and pageantry and ceremony and paraphernalia and titles, and regalia. But the wave of opposition grew and spread, until by 1800 it had engulfed and completely annihilated the Federalist Party. It was as dead as a door nail and Thomas Jefferson was in the saddle.

Yes, sir; Thomas Jefferson, the champion of the Democratic cause, was at the helm of the ship of state. He came from one of the first families of Virginia. Wealthy and blue-blooded—an aristocrat by birth, but a Democrat by choice. He wrote the Declaration of Independence, which is the charter of the Democratic Party and the first public document of the Democratic movement.

Thomas Jefferson was the indirect author of the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, the 10 torches of liberty.

Thomas Jefferson alone and single-handed destroyed the ancient law of primogenitor, which gave to the first born male all of the inheritance. "Give me one reason," said Jefferson, "why the first-born male child should have any more of the inheritance than the other children." And that one reason has not been given to this day. Jefferson, therefore, destroyed in this country that undemocratic law of primogenitor.

Hamilton would make the Union great and glorious, but Jefferson would make every citizen strong and free. Education hitherto was only for the rich, but Jefferson established the University of Virginia, the first State institution of its kind. He placed the jam and cookies on the lower shelf so every person could reach them, regardless of whether he was rich or poor.

These are the things that Jefferson stood for. These are the same principles that the same Democratic Party stands for today. And when I get to thinking of the virtue of these great doctrines, I feel like the mouse in the cellar. There was a keg of well-seasoned rye whisky, a little of it was dripping from the spigot. The mouse caught a few of these drops and then backed up against the keg and said, "Now bring on that ol' cat!"

When I dip into the fountain of democracy and drink anew from its inspiring stream I can back up against those principles and say, "Now bring on that old wolf of Wall Street, for who is afraid of the big, bad wolf!"

Then as the new Nation developed there came the era of good feeling, and the once dead Federalist or Republican Party began to show signs of life again. Gradually it revived. There grew up a clamor for more parade in government. Thus the Republicans regained control of the Government and began to use its power for special privileges. The commercial and industrial interests began to ask for laws favorable to them.

But a man came out of the West—it was the West then—a pioneer, as hard as the hickory with which he grew, a representative of "the plain people." Andrew Jackson, the lion of democracy, was in the saddle, and, excuse the slang—but what I mean, he was in the saddle.

He spurred them in the shoulder, he spurred them in the flank, he roused them on the ribs, and he whipped them over the head with the bridle. He turned those fat-handed, chronic, perpetual officeholders out by the droves; he cleaned the White House from attic to basement. He cleaned the Capitol from floor page to gallery loafer; and he went out among the pioneers and the plain common people, and he collected a bunch of the hornyhanded old Democrat boys and turned them in on the clover. He turned out the blue blood and turned in the red bloods. He decreased the economic advantage of the New England merchants and

increased the chances of the southern and western farmers and traders and trappers and woodcutters.

Jackson didn't wait for opportunities; he made them. He made them! At New Orleans he did not sit down and wring his hands and say, "This is a psychological situation. If I only had a good steel breastwork, I could meet the enemy." He built a breastwork of cotton bales and, in one of the bloodiest battles ever fought in history, defeated General Packingham, who outnumbered him 3 to 1.

With Jackson we see the second demise of the now Republican Party. Again it was as dead as a doornail. Were that party built upon principles as eternal as those that underlie the Democratic faith, it would not have so many funerals.

Pardon me, friends, if I seem to lean toward the Democratic faith; you see, my father's name was Thomas Jefferson Lee; my name is Joshua Bryan Lee.

I was rocked in a Democratic cradle,
I was fed on Democratic food,
I was spanked with a Democratic paddle,
And raised in a Democratic brood.

So please make allowance for my bursts of enthusiasm. Those truths that underlie the Democratic Party are eternal.

What has this party done? I can only hit the high spots. The following territories have been added to the United States under Democratic administrations:

The Louisiana Purchase was made by Jefferson in 1803. Florida purchased in 1819. Texas annexation in 1845. Oregon Treaty in 1846. Mexican cession in 1848. Gadsden Purchase in 1853.

The Louisiana Purchase was of far-reaching importance. It was prompted purely by a democratic motive. Spain had control of the lower Mississippi River and collected high tolls from the farmers and fur traders of the Missouri River Basin. Spain wanted to purchase this land from Napoleon to complete her control of the river. The merchants of the East opposed the United States purchase of this territory, because, first, it would anger Spain and they would lose much of her trade; and, second, if Spain closed the Mississippi to the farmers and fur traders of the basin, they would be forced to send their produce through the eastern markets. Therefore, the Democratic administration cast the ballot in favor of the pioneer and the farmer. Jefferson, by the Louisiana Purchase, kept the river for the United States and made possible our western expansion.

The following are the States that have been carved altogether or in part from land acquired under the Democratic administrations:

Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wyoming, Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, Florida, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Washington, and Oregon.

The States that have been admitted under the Democratic administrations are:

	Year
Ohio.....	1803
Indiana.....	1816
Mississippi.....	1817
Illinois.....	1818
Alabama.....	1819
Maine.....	1820
Michigan.....	1837
Iowa.....	1846
Wisconsin.....	1848
Utah.....	1896

The Republican Party comes to life only in periods of peace and prosperity; but when there is a national crisis to meet, the people turn to the party of Jefferson and Jackson.

When foreign nations threatened to gain footing on the American Continent it was a Democratic President who announced the bold and daring Monroe Doctrine under whose sheltering protection the Latin American Republics have grown free and prosperous.

When foreign nations were destroying our marine commerce it was a Democratic administration that waged and won the War of 1812.

It was a Democratic administration that fought the Blackhawk War.

It was a Democratic administration that reached a long arm across the ocean and hacked the steel from the mailed fist of Germany and offered open-handed justice to the world.

And, finally, in this depression, the greatest crisis of all, the people have turned once again to the Democratic Party.

Do you remember those last hectic days under Mr. Hoover? Now Mr. Hoover comes out of the storm cellar in his new book and says there wasn't any storm. Do you remember those last 3 months under his administration? The soup lines lengthened. Communism was knocking at our door; foreclosures on every hand. There were food riots. The feet of the unemployed wore down the grass in our public parks. The wolf of hunger crouched at a million doors.

One morning you picked up the paper and read where the banks in Arkansas closed. Next the banks in California went; and Minnesota followed with her bank holiday. Then Ohio closed, then Michigan, then New York. People stood around on the street corners and whispered to each other: "What is going to happen to our Government? Is our Constitution going to stand? Will our Government endure?" Joseph Stalin, in Russia, laughed up his sleeve. Adolf Hitler, in Germany, pointed to the United States as an example of the failure of Democratic government.

But in that critical hour there arose a clarion voice calling the people to a crusade, a crusade against selfishness; a crusade for

"the forgotten man", a crusade for human rights above property rights. That means but one person, that spells but one name: Roosevelt!

The same democratic spirit with the same lion-hearted leadership is typified by Roosevelt in his crusade for "the forgotten man" that was expressed by Jackson in his fight for "the plain people." No matter whether that leadership has come from the hermitage of Tennessee, or from Hyde Park of New York, it has been motivated by the one purpose of returning this Government to the people who ordained and established its Constitution.

COMMUNISTIC PROPAGANDA

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, for several years we have witnessed the efforts of patriotic Americans to end the dissemination of subversive, communistic propaganda. Many of the earnest men and women who engaged in this fine work did not find it easy to carry on amid the cynical attitudes of those who derided the possible dangers which could be seen only by those familiar with the situation.

However, in the course of the past 3 or 4 years, investigations conducted by the House and various other inquiries have established the fact that there exists real danger in these activities.

It has been proven that undesirable aliens not only foment strikes and disorder, but also deprive native-born citizens of employment. And the outrages committed against our American institutions both by words and deeds leave no doubt that drastic action is necessary and cannot longer be delayed.

The chief offender, as a body, is the Communist Party.

The evidence is in. Indictments on several counts have been returned. All that remains to be done is the pronouncement of sentence upon the culprit—this enemy of our organized society under our cherished and free democratic government.

The Communist Party in the United States is not a national political party in the sense that it strives to bring about changed conditions for the common man. Rather, this party enters a national ticket for the sole purpose of publicizing their group and bringing together the various malcontents and unbalanced minds which, unfortunately, are present everywhere.

The 25,000 enrolled members of the Communist International cannot by any stretch of the imagination be compared with the established party organizations maintained by the other political groups which participate in orderly elections in this country. Peaceful debate based upon intelligent principles is not to be found anywhere in their literature. Force, violence, and bloodshed are their watchwords.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no man is more concerned than I with the sanctity of our Constitution and the laws which have been established thereunder. It has been and is now contended that there is danger of violating the free-speech clause of the first amendment to the Constitution when we enact legislation to prevent the advocacy of the overthrow of our Government by force or the teaching of communistic doctrine in our schools. Those who make such contentions are no doubt correct; but there is nowhere any justification for failing to make mandatory the deportation of alien criminals. As a matter of fact, we already have, as you well know, in the act of June 5, 1920, sufficient legislative power to deport undesirable alien Communists. And here we come upon a singular situation, which I almost hesitate to point out. This situation involves the following purported facts:

First. The center of communistic agitation in New York City, where permits for parades and demonstrations are obtained with ease. At the call of their leaders, thousands of reds can be assembled in Union Square within a few hours. Plans hatched here are executed in the fruit-growing centers of California and the mines of Alabama; among the dock workers of San Francisco and in the cotton fields of the South. If the gathering of Communists in other great metropolitan centers is as nothing compared to New York, why cannot this foremost city of the world—and of which we are

all proud—why cannot this city also keep these exhibitionists from parading themselves before gullible workers?

Second. Is there any significance in the fact that our admirable and otherwise efficient Secretary of Labor comes to us from the great State of New York? I hope not, for if the two facts here recited can be said to be linked together, then the greatest responsibility for un-American activities in the United States may be laid at the threshold of New York City.

I am not attempting to impugn the honor and integrity of either the State or the city of New York; nor am I seeking to embarrass the Secretary of Labor. However, do you not feel that those Members of this House who are perturbed over the rapidly increasing growth of communism should have an explanation from some responsible source as to why the Department of Labor has been so lax in enforcing the laws regarding aliens?

It has been claimed that there are at least several thousands of aliens illegally in the United States. In this connection I wish to call attention to the open letter recently addressed to the President of the United States by an organization known as the "American Coalition." Expecting that an excess of patriotic zeal prompted many of the allegations contained in this letter, I have made a cursory inquiry to determine the truth. Unfortunately, I am compelled to admit that, as far as I have gone, I have encountered no reason to doubt the contents of this letter. This is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe I am unreasonable in reiterating that this House should have an explanation as to why the immigration laws have not been better administered. I would not like to find it necessary to formally investigate the administration of the Labor Department. I would rather go on record as being willing to receive any explanation which might be made and to place it before the House.

Several bills have been introduced providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens and to make it a crime to advocate or promote the overthrow of government by force. I feel that such legislation is imperative and most certainly will support the proper measure when it is presented for action. In the meantime, however, let us learn, if we can, what is being done to enforce similar laws already on the statutes.

CONFERENCE OF NEW MEMBERS WITH PRESIDENT URGED

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I addressed to the President on March 5 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker and Members, on the various occasions on which I have met our President, I have been favorably impressed with his sincerity and honesty of purpose. As I am more interested in national recovery than I am in party politics, and as it is further my sincere belief that our most practical hope for the alleviation or elimination of the distress of our people lies with the President, I addressed a letter to him with a view to cooperating with him along the lines of what I believe to be the "voice of the people."

Without in any way criticizing the older Members of Congress, nevertheless, it is self-evident that new Members may be expected to have a more intimate and personal understanding of the problems of the people whom it is their honor to represent in the National Capitol. Fully cognizant as I am of the high character and sincerity of purpose of the more experienced Members of the House of Representatives, with whom I feel that it is a privilege to be associated, at the same time I feel that the "young blood" of the House also has a very definite contribution to make to the solution of the problems of our people. It was this conviction which prompted me to address the letter to the President, which I herewith insert in the RECORD.

For the information of the Membership, it may be well to remark that this letter was addressed to the President prior to the call which was made assembling certain Members of Congress to a conference to discuss liberalization of House rules and the enactment of liberal legislation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1935.
His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the parlance of the advertiser—even a man's best friends will not tell him. It would appear that your immediate advisers are either ignorant of the actual status of affairs or that they are reluctant to give you the facts which, as our Chief Executive, I think you should know since I am confident that you are amenable to criticism as well as to just praise, whenever such is merited.

Since my return to the Capital, I have received only three letters out of my huge mail wherein the correspondents spoke favorably of the administration. Two of these were from Democratic politicians who were looking for jobs, and the other, from a Republican who supported your views against the McCarran amendment. All other mail has been of an extremely critical nature and some, especially condemnatory, which indicates beyond a question of doubt that the people are beginning to lose confidence in your administration and in the Congress.

There are a large number of Representatives in the House who are more friendly to you and more concerned in the welfare of the Nation than their votes and activities would perhaps indicate. The newer Members of Congress, especially from the Western and Northern States, who had a battle to be elected or reelected, could give you a panoramic picture of conditions and the recent developments which would prove that you may profit if you would consult with them.

I am anxious to see your administration a success, but my correspondence from outstanding leaders and thinking men would indicate that the new deal must be lubricated with a different kind of lubricant if it is to move forward successfully. Those of us who represent the uncertain political sections of the Nation, and who, because of our brief experience as Representatives, have not as yet absorbed the veneer of indifference to the public interest, may be in a position, if called upon, to give constructive criticism which would react in your own interest as well as that of national recovery.

If you are inclined to receive a delegation of 15 or 25 of the newer Members of Congress, to obtain from them their viewpoints on the progress thus far attained and the prospects for the future, I would be pleased to suggest a list of names of such Members who wish to cooperate with you to the fullest possible extent, but who are sacrificing their own interests if they permit conditions to develop which only radical measures may counteract.

This is submitted in your interest and in the interest of our people in the hope of alleviating, as expeditiously as possible, the increasing distress which evokes the reversal of sentiment which not only I but other Members of Congress report.

I shall be pleased to cooperate with you in the furtherance of the above suggestions at any time.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. H. HOEPEL.

EUGENE G. GRACE—SUPERPATRIOT, OR WHAT?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of Eugene G. Grace, as reflected by his statements before the Senate Munitions Committee, is more dangerous to this Nation than is all of the communistic propaganda emanating from Soviet Russia. In one breath he upheld the privilege of him and his class to extract from his nation in time of war excessive profits with which to pay ridiculously large bonuses and fat dividends; but he objected to the men who were in the danger zone asking for the one three-thousandth part of what he received. It is all too indicative of his class in their attitude toward the welfare of the Nation; whenever any of whom they regard as the proletariat expresses the desire to better his condition by fair wages, reasonable working hours, safety appliances, better living conditions, or economic security it is the "let them eat cake" attitude of the nobility of France preceding the French Revolution.

Mr. Grace is undoubtedly an able captain of industry; but evidently is a poor judge of our present national psychology. The hopes and desires of mankind cannot be forever melted in the crucible of necessity and cast in the mold of unequal distribution of profits. Pig iron and human nature are not analogous. The determination of mankind to advance is irresistible. It is like the progress of a mighty river, and although it may be temporarily held in check will eventually break forth and reach its destination. When those of the type of Mr. Grace oppose such movements as the one to take the profits out of war they only attract attention to their own provincialism which, after all, is woe-

fully limited. The Nation to him is bounded by the fences of the Bethlehem Steel Works along the Lehigh River, guarded by his private police force. Here he is king, and every human consideration is secondary to the making of steel.

Such monarchs as Mr. Grace are ever beseeching Congress for a tariff on their products under the plea that they desire to protect the American workingman from the cheap labor from abroad. What a plea, when they are the very ones who have been the most active in importing cheap foreign labor to compete with American labor in its own doorway. With industries organized upon such a magnificent scale as ours, with our domestic supply of raw material and splendid fuel, with our network of transportation lines, with the undisputed higher standard of skill and ingenuity of our workmen American industry could easily compete with foreign industry if it were not forced to pay dividends on watered stock, outrageous salaries and bonuses to active officials, and ridiculous pensions to retired officials. What a class of people to complain of a bonus to men who have made "their breasts a barricade between their country and its foes."

WE MUST PROTECT THE LITTLE FARMER

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some statistics from the Agricultural Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much of the RECORD is going to be taken up by the statistics of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SNYDER. About 4 or 5 inches of a single column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the seventeenth century our forefathers started the agricultural and industrial development march westward across our continent. The first obstacle to overcome was that of the Indians. The second was the task of clearing off sufficient acreage for farm land on which they could raise the food products necessary for a comfortable living.

Year after year the frontier moved westward until, we might say, 1849, when the gold rush to California brought about conditions that prompted men to improve transportation, take up land grants and mineral rights in such a rapid fashion that when the nineteenth century opened our lands were practically all surveyed and available for development.

Forty or fifty years ago the great fertile fields of the Middle West produced such an abundance of corn, wheat, hay, and other major crops that it astounded the Eastern farmers. One by one the more ambitious individuals interested in farming would go West and secure acreage for homes and farms not only in the Middle West, but the great Northwest and the Southeast.

From this came a development of farm machinery, mining machinery, and lumber machinery, and when the call for a superabundance of production came with the World War we were in a position not only to furnish farm products, but equipment of all kinds that was used both at home and abroad in the great world struggle.

Mills and factories sprung up as if by magic. Coal mines, ore mines, zinc mines, copper mines, and all other mineral developments were pushed to the limit.

After the war we had a relapse of 1921, and, due to the fact that we had depleted our home storehouses very largely during the war period and the war had destroyed mills and factories of many of the European countries, we found a ready market for 6 or 7 years in furnishing food products as well as manufactured products for the rehabilitation of the institutions in the war-stricken nations. Of course, the sad part of the story is, that during the fat years 1922 to 1929, our economic and social institutions were so badly managed that when the inevitable came, the crash of 1929, our institutions were not able to function.

The fall of the Roman Empire did not have the ill effects on the people of Rome as the financial and economic crash in the United States had on our people in 1929. The financial institutions of our Nation were operating on a quicksand basis, and when they were supposed to stand up and give relief to our institutions they tottered and fell, taking with them multiplied billions of dollars that the people thought was safely stored away for the rainy days ahead.

During these fat years the people flocked from the little farms and homes to the mills and factories where high wages attracted them. They were led to believe that this production period would not only continue but expand as time went on. They were not acquainted with the facts. They did not know that we had loaned foreign countries millions to buy our products to rehabilitate their countries and that this loan would not be paid when it fell due by many of the nations who borrowed from us. The result was that the mills and factories were obliged to close down. There was no demand for our products. Men by the tens of thousands were thrown out of employment, and a large percent of them are still unemployed.

We failed to keep alive in the minds of our citizens that the only creative wealth of a nation is the wealth that comes from the ground—agricultural wealth.

I fear that our schools let down in teaching the youth of the land that a nation is only prosperous in proportion as the farmers of the Nation are prosperous. I sometimes think that we fail to keep before the mental gaze of the youth of our Nation the fundamental fact that the tillers of the soil are the bulwark of a nation at all times. Furthermore, that nations decay when industry overtakes and domineers the agricultural interests of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in making appropriations for the several phases of agriculture we must bear in mind that the first thing to consider is the time period ahead. We must not only build so that our agricultural resources will take care of us in the immediate future, but that our building may expand in such a way that future generations will have agricultural facilities commensurate with the demands and needs of the day in which they live.

We cannot hope to hand down to our posterity agricultural facilities unless we immediately start on a broad and comprehensive program of developing our watersheds and forests. It is our duty right now, Mr. Speaker, to improve streams and build hundreds of dams and watersheds throughout the Nation. It is our duty to plant millions and millions of trees on the hillsides and slopes of our Nation in order that moisture may be stored to take care of dry seasons. Mr. Speaker, we see the folly of the plans and procedures of farming as it has been carried on in the Middle West for the last 50 years. It is now evident that the procedure was to get while the getting was good. Get everything from the soil and give nothing in return to the soil. That was the practice of 50 years. What is the result?

The drought in the Middle States was brought about largely because we did not protect our streams and plant trees. If the States of the Nation had been provided with sufficient watersheds and at appropriate places in these States millions of trees had been planted, there would have been no drought last summer in that once great fertile region.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am reminded of the "pumper" from California who was storm stayed in a Quaker town in Pennsylvania one Saturday night. The next morning he went to the only church in the town, which happened to be a Quaker church. After a period of time the spokesman in this church arose and said, "Brethren, none of you seem to be moved by the Spirit this morning, so we will return to our homes." At this point the "pumper" from California jumped up and said, "Mr. Leader, if nobody has anything to say about the Spirit, I would like to put in a good word for California."

At this place I want to put in a word for Pennsylvania, my native State, along the line of agriculture. My fellow colleagues mean well, I am sure, but oftentimes one would judge from the remarks and debates that Pennsylvania was not

included among the great agricultural States of the Nation. Thus I ask the privilege of inserting at this point some data and statistics with reference to the major agricultural prod-

ucts of the Nation, comparing Pennsylvania with the other States in the production of the several farm and commodity products here enumerated.

Potatoes

State	Acreage harvested (1,000 acres)			Yield per acre (bushels)			Production (1,000 bushels)			Prices received by farmers, Dec. 1 (per bushel)			Total value basis, Dec. 1 price (1,000 dollars)		
	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934
Maine.....	170	150	168	238	280	335	40,460	42,000	56,280	\$0.25	\$0.60	\$0.20	10,115	25,200	11,256
New York.....	210	200	210	135	123	155	28,350	24,600	32,550	.37	.75	.34	10,490	18,450	11,067
Michigan.....	260	265	268	115	78	128	29,900	20,670	34,304	.23	.65	.28	6,877	13,436	9,605
Wisconsin.....	260	239	261	87	70	120	22,620	16,730	31,320	.23	.55	.29	5,203	9,202	9,083
Idaho.....	99	95	104	200	230	185	19,800	21,850	19,240	.17	.41	.36	3,366	8,958	6,926
Pennsylvania.....	195	189	200	110	113	170	21,450	21,357	34,000	.45	.90	.41	9,652	19,221	13,940
Tennessee.....	51	54	60	69	66	72	3,519	3,564	4,320	.59	1.01	.76	2,076	3,600	3,283
South Carolina.....	17	16	21	85	109	125	1,445	1,744	2,625	.75	.78	.62	1,084	1,360	1,628

Pennsylvania production

	1932	1933	1934	Rank
Corn (92,200,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel).....	\$0.41	\$0.52	\$0.77	Ninth.
Value.....	19,000,000	26,000,000	40,000,000	
Rye (1,344,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel).....	.44	.67	.75	Seventh.
Value.....	682,000	1,076,000	1,800,000	
Buckwheat (3,105,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel).....	.39	.49	.52	First.
Value.....	983,000	1,347,000	1,934,000	
Hay (2,569,000 tons):				
Average price (per ton).....	9.49	10.49	15.49	Fourth.
Value.....	24,800,000	32,672,000	39,785,000	
Oats (34,915,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel).....	.28	.39	.52	Seventh.
Value.....	6,740,000	8,117,000	12,956,000	
Wheat (14,000,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel).....	.52	.81	.92	Eleventh.
Value.....	7,600,000	12,784,000	13,582,000	

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania contributes to the National Treasury more money than any other one of the 48 States of the Union, except New York. It is only natural that those outside of the State think of Pennsylvania as industrial, a place where they produce iron and steel products; but Pennsylvania takes her place among the first States in the Union in the production of a number of the major crops.

The Department of Agriculture just informed me where Pennsylvania ranks in the production of a number of the major crops, and since I have cited the above seven crops with the purpose of showing Pennsylvania's production, I will use the same seven crops as a basis of rank:

In States producing potatoes Pennsylvania ranked first on a basis of dollar value and third in the number of bushels produced as indicated above.

In States producing buckwheat Pennsylvania ranked first.

In States producing corn Pennsylvania ranked ninth.

In States producing rye Pennsylvania ranked seventh.

In States producing hay Pennsylvania ranked fourth.

In States producing wheat Pennsylvania ranked eleventh.

In States producing oats Pennsylvania ranked seventh.

The above table will show how absurd it is for the opponents of collective bargaining to say that the N. R. A. has caused Southern States like Tennessee to plow down their acreage for potatoes and thus crowd the northern market.

For instance, look at the potato production of Tennessee for the last 3 years. Few more bushels were grown in the entire State than was grown in one of my counties, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture informs us that not one single carload of Tennessee potatoes in 1933, 1934, or 1935 was unloaded in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that the price of potatoes during the last 3 years in the several States enumerated fluctuated—1933 being the peak year of the 3 years. Of course, that is nothing unusual. When potatoes reached the price they did in 1933, the Department of Agriculture shows that potato growers increased their acreage and thus put on the market for 1934 many more millions of bushels. Now, those who are not favorable to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, naturally are satisfied with the prices as they come and

go. They have no complaint to make if potatoes are 20 cents one day and 60 cents the next, because they hold that the law of supply and demand should govern the price. On the other hand, those who believe that there should be a minimum and maximum of stability in prices in the various crops favor the crop production act. It is as self-evident as night follows day, that if the present procedure is dropped, the little farmers in the East, such as Pennsylvania, will go back just where they were in 1932 when wheat was selling for 52 cents per bushel as compared with 92 cents per bushel this year.

Of course adjustments in farm-crop production cannot be set aright in a year or two. It will take time—a space of years. All progressive farmers concede that conditions that existed in 1931 and 1932 should not be permitted to return. Little by little the Agriculture Department is adjusting this phase in favor of the small farmer, and if given time the small farmer will be restored to a place where he will be on a par with the large producers, and the cutthroat practices will be eliminated.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address delivered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] on Andrew Jackson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert an address delivered by Hon. J. P. RICHARDS, Member of Congress, on March 15, 1935, the birthday of Andrew Jackson, at the memorial exercises held at the Andrew Jackson Monument, Washington, D. C., sponsored by the Women's Democratic Educational Council.

The address is as follows:

Madam president, members of the Women's Democratic Educational Council, distinguished guests, I appreciate very much the invitation you have extended me to be present here today and to deliver this memorial address in honor of the birthday of Andrew Jackson, great Democrat, great American, and seventh President of the United States. You have selected the appropriate place for this occasion—here within a stone's throw of the White House, where he lived and labored as President for a number of years—here in the shadows of the great bronze monument erected to his memory by a grateful Nation.

Long ago the earlier civilizations of this planet adopted the custom, and found it to be a worth-while investment in the development of a better citizenship to erect monuments and memorials to departed great men who had lived and wrought for the lasting benefit of the people whom they left behind. The people of Rome built monuments to her Emperors, and to her lawmakers who had thundered in the Roman Senate. The Egyptians built the pyramids to protect the dead bodies of her Kings. Greece perpetuated the memory of her patriots by likenesses of beautiful marble. The people of our own civilization also believe in this custom, and today monuments to illustrious departed sons, who helped to mold these United States, dot every square of this, the Capital of our country, as they dot the gathering places in our other cities and towns.

But, Madam President, the greatest monument built to any man is the reservation of a place in the hearts of a people in memory of the works he has done. Stone or marble or bronze may not stand forever, but a place in the hearts of men and women lingers for unnumbered generations and will never perish.

So we have come to the foot of this monument today, at the request of this patriotic band of Democratic women, honored by the presence of one of Andrew Jackson's distinguished relatives, not only to gaze upon the likeness of this great Democrat, whose soul was returned 90 years ago to the God who gave it, but also to proclaim to the men and women of our country our reverence for his memory and the political principles he stood for and fought for with the flaming sword of conscientious conviction.

This man Andrew Jackson, "who came from nowhere, determined to be somebody", how did he stamp his personality upon a nation? By what means did he breathe life into a great slumbering political party? Why is his memory ever present everywhere in this country where battle is being waged for the rights of the masses of our people today? Where was he first nursed on the milk of love for liberty?

The life and achievements of this man stagger the imagination and lend hope to every obscure lad today facing poverty, adversity, and seemingly insurmountable obstacles. His father, a poor Irish immigrant, came to this country in 1765 and settled in the Waxhaw's old Lancaster district, now Lancaster County, S. C., and died a few months before his great son's birth at the Crawford place in Lancaster County on March 15, 1767. His bones still rest in the old Waxhaw cemetery a few miles north of the town of Lancaster. Andrew Jackson's mother died during his early youth. Faced with almost every known hardship he was able to attend school very little in his boyhood. His earliest impressions were received in the fiery crucible of the Revolution, and this period branded patriotism and love of freedom on his heart. He, himself, took part in battle at the age of 11, and even so early his spirit would admit no defeat. Ambitious to be a lawyer, but without education, he was undismayed, and after moving to North Carolina was admitted to the bar of that State. Then, sensing the possibilities of the frontier, he moved to what is now the State of Tennessee and established a law office at the present site of the city of Nashville. From then on his rise was meteoric. He was solicitor of the superior court, member of the first constitutional convention of Tennessee, Member of Congress, then United States Senator, which position he resigned to sit on the Supreme Court of Tennessee; planter, trader, and merchant, major general of militia, Indian fighter, and duelist, victor over the British at New Orleans in the War of 1812, conqueror of the Indians at Horse Shoe Bend, conqueror and territorial governor of Florida; nominated by the Democrats for the Presidency in 1822, sent again to the Senate 1823, nominated again for President by the Democratic Party and elected President in 1828 and served two terms; always during the entire period of his political activity he was a flashing meteor across the horizon of his country.

His career covered amazingly one-third of the States of the Union, and everywhere, always, he was a man of action. As a general, he was unversed in the written art of war, but a genius in the leadership of men. While unfamiliar with the culture of superficial society, still he was a master of the graces when he chose. His love for his wife was beautiful, and he was the soul of chivalry in his dealings with all of the gentler sex. A diamond, admittedly unpolished by our so-called "civilization", but also uncorrupted by its glamour.

Andrew Jackson was a loyal friend but a bitter enemy. Such a man is always great or ignoble in the eyes of his contemporaries. It is admitted here that he erred time and time again, but never did he indicate weakness of character. But we, who have gathered here today in his memory, have come to review his works over the smoldering ashes of almost a century. Providence brought him to the Nation at a critical time. Our country then was torn within. Then, as now, the fight was the masses against special interests. Jackson grasped the flaming banner of democracy and coined the phrase that has been the battle cry of democracy since that time—"Let the people rule." Protection of the rights of the whole people was his aim to the point of obsession; yet he was one of those strong characters often seen in the van of world events, who, while demanding and obtaining consideration of his own personal views by those over him in authority, still could understand and brook no opposition to his own opinions when he himself was the commanding officer—a strange inconsistency we often find in the lives of the great.

The enemies of Jackson say that he practiced in politics the "spoils system", and attempt to damn him for this as the most vulnerable spot in his armor. This determination of Jackson to have around him in office only those of his own political party was more than a mere desire to reward friends; it was because of an abiding belief that real loyalty in politics, or elsewhere, can come only from friends. He knew that to carry out his policies he must have the faithful around him and he believed that one traitor in his own camp is more dangerous than a thousand without. Could we expect otherwise of a man who was nursed in the cradle of the Revolutionary War, where every man in his eyes was a patriot or a traitor; of a man who had battled against the Indians, where the combatants in his eyes were either civilized or savage; of a man who had faced all the hardships of the frontier and found men of that day, as now, either true or false? After all, who is there among us here today who does not believe in rewarding a friend before an enemy; who of us would not select a Democrat to carry our Democratic principles in preference to someone of another political faith?

The Democratic Party has ever been the party of the real people of this country. There have been times when because of overdoses of prosperity we have been lulled to sleep; but, in times when the welfare of our people have been at stake, it has been to our great old party that the people turned for relief;

and on such occasions a Democrat has, with possibly one or two exceptions, been placed in the White House. The names of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and now Franklin D. Roosevelt challenge comparison with the names of the great from any other political faith. They came from divergent stations and walks of life but came with eyes set to the same goal—a happier and more prosperous people.

As I stand here today, I let my mind's eye go back for over a century and a half to the lonely Waxhaw country in the red hills of my home county and State. I see a lonely, hungry, homely country boy, without one single favorable advantage except courage and ambition and an abiding faith in the future of his country—I see him leave his home and blaze a path to fame—I see him enter the doors yonder as President of the United States. I see him leave those walls and go back to his home in Tennessee to die enshrined in the hearts of his people—a great reward for courage and honesty, and a tribute to the possibilities for youth in this great country of ours.

Another great Democratic President is over there in the White House now. He did not come from poverty as Andrew Jackson did, but he has the same unquenchable desire to help all of the people of our country. Sometimes when he is wearied by toll and the responsibilities of his great office, or, perchance, discouraged by setbacks of the day, I can imagine his looking across the way to the old warrior, sitting his charger here, for a comforting word; and I can almost hear Jackson whisper: "Fight it out. Have faith in democracy. Listen to your real friends. Let the people rule!"

PAYMENT OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Idaho has memorialized the Congress in respect to the payment of the adjusted-service certificates. I ask unanimously consent that the memorial referred to appear in the RECORD and that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. During the present session of Congress I think we have fallen into a very bad practice of inserting in the body of the RECORD resolutions and memorials from States and city councils, and so forth. I observed in the RECORD the other day a resolution or memorial from even a city council.

The universal practice heretofore has been merely to file these resolutions from States and legislative bodies, together with other petitions or memorials, and they are noted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, but not printed in full. That has, I believe, been the invariable practice.

Mr. SNELL. And that is correct, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I feel quite sure that the practice of incorporating in the body of the RECORD petitions and memorials and what not from States and boards of aldermen throughout the Nation is a practice that has grown up in this session of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are 48 States whose legislatures are continually passing resolutions. It so happens that in the Legislature of the State of Texas, I think our State senate, has already passed half a dozen resolutions which they have sent up here to the Texas Members of Congress. Suppose we printed all of them in the RECORD and then printed a like number from all of the other 47 States. If we are going to continue to put them into the body of the RECORD, it will cost a lot of money, and we will not have any place for the regular proceedings of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Further, the great State of Wisconsin the other day wrote to both branches of Congress and asked if these petitions or memorials from the States addressed to Congress were of any worth, or had any influence. As far as I know that great State of Wisconsin received a reply that it might just as well save the expense of printing those memorials and resolutions. I think the practice which has grown up is objectionable and that it should not be permitted to continue. It is all right, perhaps, to refer to these memorials in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, as in this instance it could be properly noted that a memorial had been filed by the great sovereign State of Idaho.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] if he expects to object to having this inserted in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman does not, I shall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the great State of Idaho, represented by their legislature, and their Representatives here at the Capitol, desire this information to be conveyed to the Congress. I know of no better way of doing it than this.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the business of the House, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the legislation to be considered on the floor of this House within the next few days to provide for the immediate payment of the ex-service men's adjusted-compensation certificates, and that the Members of this body may know the sentiment of the people of the State of Idaho as expressed by their duly elected Representatives, I desire to place before the House a joint resolution of the Idaho State Legislature, urging Congress to pass this legislation.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Franklin Girard, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial no. 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the extraordinary session of the Twenty-third Legislature of the State of Idaho and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Idaho March 11, 1935, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1935.

[SEAL]

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Memorial 1

(By Mr. Dow)

A joint memorial

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to provide for the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates with all interest and charges against them eliminated; and

Whereas, should this be enacted into law at the present time, it will alleviate suffering among thousands of needy ex-service men and will in a large measure restore confidence; and

Whereas it will throw into the channels of trade and commerce many millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America early and favorable consideration of such legislation as will bring about the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 9th day of March 1935.

G. P. MIX,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 9th day of March 1935.

TROY D. SMITH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial no. 1 originated in the senate during the extraordinary session of the Twenty-third Legislature of the State of Idaho.

MORRIS STACY,
Secretary of the Senate.

PROBLEMS OF A NEW CONGRESSMAN

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an address delivered over the radio last night by my colleague from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] on the subject of free speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas, March 17, 1935:

Fellow Americans, I am a new Congressman, so you'll forgive me for repeating my name just once, MAURY MAVERICK—last name M-A-V-E-R-I-C-K, MAVERICK. I hail from the great State of Texas and from the famous city of San Antonio, where stands the Alamo—you know about the Battle of the Alamo, where every man died in defense of liberty.

Let me tell you a little about being a new Congressman and how it feels. You see, there are a hundred and ten of us, mostly Democrats, but also Republicans, Progressives, and Farmer Laborites. About 1 in 4 of all the Members of the House of Representatives are new, and I consider it an honor to serve with such a group of fine men. Without respect to party, I consider these new men the best set of soldiers of the Republic that I have ever known.

Of course, we had a lot to learn, but we're learning fast and working hard, and I am not apologizing either for myself or for the group. We were sent here to represent our districts now; not 2 years from now, but right now. The situation that faces you and me in our daily lives, and our children—who ought to have some future—and our old people—who ought to have some security in their old age—is nothing less than desperate. Of course, things are getting better and at our noonday pompous luncheon clubs we still slap each other on the back and sing Ring around the Rosy, our chambers of commerce everywhere still boost our particular city as having the best water and scenery on earth, but you know and I know we are face to face with a great stone wall of truth and can't get around it.

Let me make a point which you already know, and that is the Government is not in Washington but where you hear this voice. Here in this room, your room, and others all over the Nation, the people of this country, why, there is your government. And you know if we here in Washington appropriate, say, a million dollars or a billion or so, we—that's you—pay it back plus interest from now to all eternity. What we must do is to find a way to solve this depression, to revive business, and put our people back to work.

But about the new Congressmen—after we were assigned our offices, we began to read our trunks and bales of correspondence, and soon we found we have the hardest jobs of our lives, must learn new rules of procedure, myriads of governmental questions, meet new people, learn the town, find out something about some several thousand bills that have already been introduced concerning every idea, panacea, and remedy on earth—and after a good 12 to 16 hours' work a day, we must find time to sleep a little.

On the first day of Congress I walked in and all the old Members were shaking hands; we freshmen walked in like scared rabbits and couldn't tell a new Member from an old, except that a new Member looked lonesome and an old Member looked happy. I never loved my home town of San Antonio, Tex., so much in all my life; I felt homesick; and I sort of wanted to be home and hear some of our American Mexicans sing El Rancho Grande—amigos de San Antonio salud!—but in a few days we could at least get in the door without being stopped as a wide-eyed tourist, and then we began to feel natural again.

Oh, fellow Americans, this is a grand and beautiful city, when we came it was snow-clad, but now the buds are coming out; and you'll have to give it to Mr. Roosevelt, he moved the Capitol away from his home town down here to Washington. You see, the Capitol was really up a little street in New York, but now it's on one end of Pennsylvania Avenue, in Washington, D. C., where it belongs. And I hope I can help in keeping the Capitol here in Washington, because the crowd up the little street in New York seem to make progress, occasionally, in taking the Government back away from us.

But old and new—Congressmen have plenty of work. And it has been pleasant here, because the old Members of Congress have been very kind to us; and if I have any idea of Congress at all, we came at the most critical time in history. In a time like this we must be calm and steadfast.

And the basic foundation of our country, the first amendment to the Constitution, is still more important than all the rest—listen. It says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Now why is it important? The reason is that unless we preserve these rights we will never know the truth or have the right kind of Government. For the Lord said: "Ye shall know the truth and it will make thee free."

Remember also that free speech means free speech, and do not be deterred from protecting it in every way, including those whom you bitterly oppose. Don't let some big shot, or some poor fellow fed with lies or propaganda shout "radical" or "socialist" and stop you from listening or thinking. No label put on you can keep you from being a good American. Roosevelt needs men and women who use their own heads.

You should oppose all legislation which prevents the exercise of our constitutional liberties, because you cannot then protect yourself; without free speech there will be no intelligent education, no knowledge, and no progress.

Here's something important—read the President's message to Congress about the Power Trust and the holding companies. That

is by far the best State document our President has written at this term of Congress. Don't believe the propaganda of the Power Trust that anything is going to be confiscated by your Government. Do you think the Government would treat you like the Insull interests treated the people? This is a move in exactly the right direction. If you really want a copy, reviewing the whole power question, write to your own Congressman for a copy of the President's message.

And now, my friends, I'll have to leave you for the while. Remember two things: First, to preserve free speech and liberty for everybody—listen, think, and study; and, second, that the President is all right on the power issue, and needs the help of you people who use your own heads.

Good night to my people back home. Say! they tell me the bluebonnets are out, and the laurel and huiache are beautiful. And good night to everybody everywhere in the country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. Is it the plan to call up the rule on the bonus matter tomorrow?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am subject to the leadership of the House. I understand that is the plan.

Mr. SNELL. I am doing the gentleman the honor of taking it for granted that he is a part of the leadership of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no; I am subject to the leadership, and if the leadership directs me to call up the rule tomorrow, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman say whether we may expect that rule to be called up tomorrow?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a reasonable expectation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the rules provide for 1 hour's debate upon the rule itself and 10 hours' debate upon the bill. It will be in order tomorrow, and I think nothing else will interfere with it.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 19th of March, will the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birthday of William Jennings Bryan. I represent his district in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to address this House tomorrow for 10 minutes upon the life and character of William Jennings Bryan. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—1936

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill, H. R. 5255, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 5255, and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 26, 34, 35, 43, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 38, 39, 41, 46, and 50, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$67,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That this limitation shall not operate to reduce the compensation of any stenographer now employed nor shall the salary of any stenographer drawing more than \$2,500 per annum hereafter be increased"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$758,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$671,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,802,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Shellfish investigation: To provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States, including purchase of equipment and supplies, including boats and floating equipment and the maintenance and operation thereof; hire and charter of vessels and boats; pay of officers and crews and other personal services, including temporary employees (not exceeding \$4,000 in the District of Columbia) as may be necessary, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses connected therewith, \$100,000, of which \$50,000 shall be immediately available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. OLIVER,
THOS. S. McMILLAN,
ROBERT L. BACON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr.,
KEY PITTMAN,
FREDERICK HALE,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 48, 49 are all clarifying amendments of a minor character. The House managers have concurred on all amendments except no. 48 and no. 49, upon which the Senate managers have receded.

On amendment no. 1: Appropriates \$23,000, as proposed by the Senate, for publishing territorial papers of the United States, instead of \$18,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 2: Appropriates \$3,293,395 for salaries of Foreign Service officers, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,150,000, as provided by the House.

On amendments nos. 15, 16, 17, and 23: Restores to the bill \$1,470, as proposed by the Senate. The effect of these three amendments is to permit the American member of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy, to receive a salary of \$7,500 per annum, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment no. 24: Appropriates \$60,000, as provided by the Senate, for a survey to be made by the American section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

On amendment no. 25: Appropriates \$67,000 for special surveys or investigations to be made by the International Joint Commission, instead of \$52,000, as provided by the House, and \$71,000, as proposed by the Senate. The effect of this amendment is to reduce the amount available for the so-called "sulphur fumes" investigation from \$19,000, as proposed by the Senate, to \$15,000.

On amendment no. 26: Appropriates \$164,000 for the expenses of the General and Special Claims Convention, United States and Mexico, as proposed by the House, instead of \$170,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment no. 33: Appropriates \$25,000 for printing and binding in the Court of Claims, instead of \$24,000, as proposed by the House, and \$31,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment no. 34: Eliminates the allowances for living quarters and fuel, heat, and light for the officers and employees of the United States Court for China. The Senate amendment proposed to authorize these allowances, which had been eliminated by the House.

On amendment no. 35: Allows \$40,000 for expenses of the United States Court for China, as proposed by the House, instead of \$43,410, as approved by the Senate.

On amendment no. 37: Inserts the Senate amendment preventing the limitation on salaries of stenographers to circuit or district judges of the United States from operating to reduce the salary of any stenographer now employed, and further provides that no stenographer now drawing more than the \$2,500 salary limitation shall hereafter be increased in salary.

On amendment no. 38: Inserts the Senate amendment permitting the appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce in the Department of Commerce to be used for investigation, research, and experimentation to develop and improve aids to aircraft, aircraft power plants, and accessories.

On amendment no. 39: Inserts the Senate amendment permitting the use of the appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce in the Department of Commerce to replace four airplanes instead of two, as provided by the House.

On amendment no. 42: Appropriates \$758,000 for testing and inspection work of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, instead of \$743,000, as proposed by the House, and \$763,000, as approved by the Senate.

On amendment no. 43: Appropriates \$671,500 for research and development work of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, instead of \$656,500, as proposed by the House, and \$676,500, as agreed to by the Senate.

On amendments no. 44 and 45: Corrects the total of appropriations for the Bureau of Standards to accord with action taken on amendments nos. 42 and 43.

On amendment no. 46: Appropriates \$15,000 for enforcement of the black bass law, Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce. This item was eliminated by the House and inserted in the Senate.

On amendment no. 47: Appropriates \$100,000 for a shellfish investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce, of which amount \$50,000 is made immediately available. The amendment of the Senate appropriated \$250,000 and made \$125,000 immediately available. The amendment as agreed to reduces the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia from \$7,500 to \$4,000.

On amendment no. 50: Increases the House limitation of \$22,600 for allowances for living quarters, heat, fuel, and light, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Labor, to \$36,000, as proposed by the Senate.

W. B. OLIVER,
THOS. S. McMILLAN,
ROBERT L. BACON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report; but pending that I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] if he desires any time?

Mr. BACON. I would like to have not more than 5 minutes to discuss two phases of this report just for the RECORD.

Mr. OLIVER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, there are two phases of this conference report that I want to touch upon for the RECORD.

When the bill was before the House we brought to the attention of the House the fact that the Foreign Service of the United States, unless there was restoration of the cut made by the Budget, would be very adversely affected and would probably be on the road to disintegration. I am glad to say that the President reconsidered the proposal and sent a special message and a special budget recommendation to the Senate, and the approximate amount originally cut from the bill has been restored. I am informed by the State Department that this will permit of a new class coming in

at the bottom by competitive examination. There has not been a competitive examination since 1931.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. I know the gentleman desires to be accurate, but the President did not reconsider. He had that in mind at the time the cut was made, and that statement was made to the House.

Mr. BACON. Yes. That is quite correct. I accept the correction of the gentleman from Alabama.

There is one other matter I want to touch upon, and that is the appropriation for the eradication of the pests that are now threatening the oyster industry from Maine to Texas. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] brought in a bill authorizing \$500,000. The Senate granted \$250,000, and we have cut that estimate to \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my present remarks at this point a break-down of how that money will be spent by the Bureau of Fisheries. This break-down was furnished me by the Bureau of Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON]?

Mr. McFARLANE. Reserving the right to object, what is the nature of the break-down?

Mr. BACON. This is an appropriation for the eradication of the pests that are destroying the oyster industry. Because of the fact that the matter never came before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and was inserted in the Senate, there being no hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, it seems wise to inform the membership of the House who are interested, how that money is going to be spent.

Mr. McFARLANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OYSTER-PEST CONTROL BY THE BUREAU OF FISHERIES

The production of oysters in the United States has fallen from one hundred and fifty to one hundred and sixty million pounds from 1912 to 1929 to 70,000,000 pounds in the last 3 years. The decrease was accompanied by a considerable reduction in price to the fishermen, so that the majority of them are in great economic distress. This situation has been aggravated further by an extraordinary abundance and spread of oyster enemies, chiefly the starfish, drill, and leech. The latter, for instance, has destroyed in less than 2 years approximately one million bushels of marketable oysters in Apalachicola Bay, Fla., and is now spreading to adjacent areas.

Because of the wide spread of the pests and their tendency to migrate from one place to another without regard to State boundaries, their eradication and control require a well-organized and unified campaign which the individual States are unable to undertake. The following project combines investigational activities with the practical measures of eradication. Investigation is especially urgent in case of the leech, the life history of which is not known. Although the presence of this organism on oyster beds was reported about 20 years ago, it has not been considered destructive to oysters until its recent outbreak in Florida.

The oystermen in New England and North Atlantic States have been fighting the starfish since the beginning of the oyster industry. During the last 5 years there has been a considerable increase in the abundance of this pest in northern waters, and thousands of bushels of oysters ready for the market were destroyed. The Bureau has made preliminary experiments with the use of various chemicals in combating the starfish, but the work was discontinued 3 years ago on account of lack of funds.

Further experimentation is necessary for developing a more efficient method of eradication than dredging or mopping which is now in use.

Several years ago, as a result of careful studies, the Bureau published two papers on the drill in which the methods of control were suggested. It is therefore necessary to carry on field experiments with the view of improving the effectiveness of the traps designed by the Bureau. The same program is applicable to the conch or borer which takes the place of the drill in the southern waters.

The proposed work comprises three separate projects which geographically overlap each other. The States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York are primarily concerned with the starfish and to a lesser degree with the drill. In the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and to a certain extent in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, the oyster drill is of paramount importance. The outbreak of the leech in Apalachicola Bay and the possibility of its spread to the

adjacent waters is of great concern in Florida. In Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas the oyster bottoms suffer from an attack of conch or borer, the distribution of which is highly localized.

In order to provide for an efficient management of the campaign of eradication, the whole coastal area will be divided in four principal sections with a regional director in charge of each section. The first section comprises Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, with headquarters at New Haven, Conn. The second section covers New Jersey and Delaware, headquarters at Port Norris, N. J.; the third one includes Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, headquarters at Beaufort, N. C.; the fourth section comprises Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, headquarters at Apalachicola, Fla. A brief outline of the work to be carried out in each section follows:

FIRST SECTION (FROM MASSACHUSETTS TO NEW YORK)

Control of starfish by means of dredging and mopping. Investigation regarding the life history, spawning habits, and migrations of starfish. Field experiments with traps. Study of the chemical-control methods—laboratory and field experiments with copper sulphate, alum salts, and other substances. Eradication of oyster drills by means of traps. Amount allotted, \$73,000.

SECOND SECTION (NEW JERSEY AND DELAWARE)

Control and eradication of the drill. Field experiments with improved types of traps. Observations on migrations and spawning habits of the drill. Control of starfish (mopping and use of chemicals). Amount allotted, \$19,000.

THIRD SECTION (FROM MARYLAND TO GEORGIA)

Control and eradication of the drill in lower Chesapeake Bay, Tangier Sound, and eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia. Field experiments with improved types of traps. Survey of oyster bottoms in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, with the view of determining the places of infestation by drills and conchs; eradication of these pests by dredging and trapping. Amount allotted, \$55,000.

FOURTH SECTION (FROM FLORIDA TO TEXAS)

Investigation of the life history of the leech. Experiments on methods of its eradication. Dredging and cleaning the destroyed reefs in Apalachicola Bay. Survey of oyster bottoms in Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, with the view of determining the localities infested with conchs and boring clams. Eradication of these pests by dredging and trapping. Control and eradication of conch in Louisiana. Amount allotted, \$103,000.

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project, by States

		Labor	Other	Total
Massachusetts.....	Starfish.....	\$45,000	\$28,000	\$73,000
Rhode Island.....				
Connecticut.....				
New York.....				
New Jersey.....	Drill.....	15,000	4,000	19,000
Delaware.....				
Maryland.....				
Virginia.....				
North Carolina.....	do.....	25,000	5,000	30,000
South Carolina.....				
Georgia.....				
Florida.....				
Alabama.....	Boring sponge.....	20,000	5,000	25,000
Mississippi.....				
Louisiana.....				
Texas.....				
Florida.....	Leech.....	40,000	25,000	65,000
Alabama.....	Conch.....	15,000	4,000	19,000
Mississippi.....	Leech.....	15,000	4,000	19,000
Louisiana.....	Conch.....	15,000	4,000	19,000
Texas.....	Boring clam.....	15,000	4,000	19,000
Total.....		175,000	75,000	250,000

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project

Personnel:	
Investigative, administrative, supervisory, and clerical positions, including travel and subsistence, 20 percent.....	\$50,000
Labor for trapping drills, mopping starfish, and tonging and dredging leech-infested waters, 50 percent.....	125,000
Other expenses:	
Materials and supplies, 10 percent.....	24,000
Equipment, 4 percent.....	10,000
Purchase, hire, and maintenance of vessels, vehicles, and laboratories, 14 percent.....	36,000
Miscellaneous, 2 percent.....	5,000
Total.....	250,000

REDUCED PROJECT FOR OYSTER-PEST CONTROL

Should the appropriation for the pest-control project be limited to \$100,000, the work in general will follow the outline given above, with the difference that the greatest part of the money will be spent for investigation and field experiments in those sections where the pests are already known to be very abundant and destructive. The two projects differ in the amount of actual eradication work.

Under \$250,000 appropriation an additional \$125,000 will be spent for manual labor engaged in eradication work and \$25,000 for hire of boats and purchase of material and supplies. Consequently under the smaller appropriation there will be a higher overhead, for the same amount of research work carried out.

The difference in actual operations in various sections can be summarized as follows: In the northern section no dredging and mopping of starfish will be carried out, and the work will consist of field and laboratory experiments on extermination of starfish, studies of its migration, use of chemicals in protecting oyster beds, and destroying young starfish.

In New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia the number of drill traps used in eradication will be materially reduced. In Florida the work will be limited to the study of the life history of the leech, methods of eradication, and their application in the field. No dredgings or tonging will be carried out on the destroyed reefs, the centers of infestation from which the leech spreads to adjacent territories.

In the Gulf States a distribution of the pests will be studied and field experiments on their eradication will be carried on on a small scale.

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project, by States

State	Labor	Other	Total
Massachusetts.....	\$16,500	\$3,950	\$20,450
Rhode Island.....			
Connecticut.....			
New York.....			
New Jersey.....	10,000	2,000	12,000
Delaware.....			
Maryland.....			
Virginia.....			
North Carolina.....	10,400	5,000	15,400
South Carolina.....			
Georgia.....			
Florida.....			
Alabama.....	6,700	3,250	9,950
Mississippi.....			
Louisiana.....			
Texas.....			
Florida.....	11,600	11,250	22,850
Alabama.....			
Mississippi.....			
Louisiana.....			
Texas.....	5,400	2,000	7,400
Florida.....			
Alabama.....			
Mississippi.....			
Louisiana.....	4,700	2,250	6,950
Texas.....			
Total.....			100,000

Estimated expenditures, oyster pest project, total, \$100,000.

Personnel:	
Investigative, administrative, supervisory, and clerical positions, including travel and subsistence.....	\$36,000
Labor, for field tests, trapping drills, tonging oysters, and boat crews.....	23,000
Other expenses:	
Materials and supplies.....	10,500
Equipment.....	7,500
Purchase, hire, and maintenance of vessels, vehicles, and laboratories.....	20,500
Miscellaneous.....	2,500
Total.....	41,000

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I notice in the report that there has been placed in the bill the amount necessary for the enforcement of the Black Bass Act.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was very much amused, being a member of the Committee on Accounts, to see on the bill of fare in the House Restaurant time and time again fresh-water bass. I know that our distinguished colleague in charge of the restaurant would not tolerate the purchase and sale of any bass contrary to law. Fresh water is probably a misnomer, and by calling attention to it I know the matter will be corrected.

Mr. OLIVER. I will state that our committee has felt this appropriation item should either be discontinued or preferably the item transferred to the Department of Agriculture, where in our judgment it appropriately belongs, and can with the aid of the Department of Justice be effectively enforced. The Senate, however, holds a different view and we have yielded to their insistence.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not object to the appropriation, but I do not think the law should be violated in the Capitol.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. With regard to the eradication of pests in the oyster industry, there was a measure introduced in the House by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. The House took a definite attitude in connection with that item. There was a committee appointed by the Speaker of the House, of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is chairman. I really believe that the appropriation

with regard to matters of this particular kind ought to be considered and acted upon by that committee that has been created to consider subjects of that kind. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] if he has had an opportunity to go into this matter of the eradication of pests in the oyster industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The investigation is very necessary.

Mr. MEAD. But the gentleman's committee has not had an opportunity to go into it as yet?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The President vetoed the bill reported out by the committee to which the gentleman referred, and in the veto message stated there was existing authority, in his opinion, to make the appropriation. This appropriation is more than the Bureau of the Budget estimated was necessary, and since the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] has inserted in the RECORD the break-down of how the Bureau of Fisheries has indicated the money might be spent, I simply want to say that the expenditure will be carefully reviewed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries, and perhaps by the President, with a view of seeing that no money is imprudently spent. Neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] nor I wish any of the money uselessly spent. We are hopeful that there will first be a scientific study, with a view of determining whether some way can be found for eradicating the pests, because it is a matter of great importance to the oyster industry. Simply because we give them \$100,000 is no invitation to wastefully spend the money. I have communicated with the Bureau of Fisheries, who have very distinguished scientists, and we think they will be cautious in the expenditure of this money. They will make preliminary studies with a view of determining whether there is reasonable promise of practical remedies being found whereby these pests can be eradicated before spending large sums on untried methods.

Mr. MEAD. But in view of the fact we have this separate committee, I just thought I would bring it to the attention of the House that the Members might know what was being done in the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a statement this morning in reference to some items carried in the four department bills, and especially in connection with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Commerce Department. I find, however, that there is an important bill which the House is anxious to dispose of today, which will be taken up after this conference report, and for that reason I will omit any extended statement as to the matters I had intended discussing.

I will ask your unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks, selected excerpts from four statements made by representatives of leading business organizations before our committee when hearings were being had on the appropriations for the Department of Commerce. Since these statements are from distinguished representatives of large business organizations, I invite the careful reading of the same by Members of the House. The appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were drastically cut as a result of our drive for economy in Government expenditures from more than five millions to approximately \$2,000,000, and the useful service it had been rendering was seriously interfered with. The Budget submitted an increase for this Bureau for 1936, and our committee increased the Budget recommendation, but still the amount carried for this important service is, in my judgment, probably inadequate. The statements made by business organizations as to the helpful service which this Bureau is rendering at this time suggests that when this matter is later brought to the attention of the President and the Bureau of the Budget the appropriation for this Bureau will be further increased, and I wish now to say that our committee, in view of the representations which business men generally have submitted to our committee, will give sympathetic consideration to any reasonable increase in appropriations for this Bureau. Dr. Murchison, the Director, is able and enjoys the full confidence of the American business men, and deserves credit for

the efficient service which the Bureau has rendered with its limited appropriation. Dr. Dickenson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, under whom this Bureau falls, is likewise very much interested in its work, and at the suggestion of our committee, extended to certain representative business men an invitation to appear before our committee when the hearings were being had. From the statements made by these business men, I now ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentlemen who appeared before the committee and made statements were as follows:

Mr. Harry Tipper, executive vice president American Manufacturers' Export Association; Mr. Phanor J. Eder, director of international and comparative law section of the American Bar Association, Pan American Society, and Colombian American Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Wallace Thompson, representing National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations; Mr. Eugene Thomas, president National Foreign Trade Council, New York City.

I first submit the following excerpts from the statement of Mr. Harry Tipper. The full statement of Mr. Tipper will appear on pages 283 and 284 of the hearings—

Mr. TIPPER. Mr. Chairman, the association that I represent has 450 members who are scattered generally over the United States, and the industrial divisions include practically every form of exporting, from locomotives to chewing gum, so that the association deals widely with the subject of export trade.

The board of directors of the association has been gravely concerned over the curtailment of the services of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, because of the numerous reactions from the members of the association in that they have not been able to secure the customary services from the Bureau to the extent and with the facility that they were able to secure them in the past. At a time when the conditions of doing export business are more severe and involve more problems than heretofore, and when the information has become increasingly important and valuable and more imperative, it has been rather tragic that the services should be so seriously cut. The most important questions and those which are asked most frequently by our members relate to economic conditions abroad, in various countries—the financial conditions of the country, the general trade conditions, the balance of trade, the specific character of trade, the principal products of the country; the tariff and regulation conditions, which are subject to a vast amount of change and involve a vast amount of difficulty; customs procedure, and information on the general consumption and the general competitive situation nationally; that is, what other countries are supplying to that region and what competition there is from other nations in the market.

Those are the questions that our members indicated they asked most frequently, and it is for that reason that they so regularly apply to the Bureau for information, in addition, of course, to using the statistics which the Bureau supplies regularly, and upon which all exporters depend for their basic information.

Mr. OLIVER. The members of the committee are quite familiar with the history of this Bureau. Of course, at one time it was very rapidly expanded in its personnel, both at home and abroad, and I assume that special attention was given them, and has been given since, to the selection of business men well qualified to understand business problems and to interpret the information which you sought in the language of the business man here at home. If this service has been helpful to you, as you indicate, it is probably primarily due to the fact that such statistics as may have been gathered abroad or at home have been interpreted in the light of your present business problems, and by persons who were familiar with business conditions at home.

I now wish to quote the following parts of the statement made by Mr. Phanor J. Eder. His full statement will be found on pages 284, 285, and 286:

Mr. EDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been in business contact with the export and import trade for about 30 years, sometimes almost personally engaged in it, but chiefly as a lawyer for export houses and some import houses.

There is very little that I can add to what Mr. Tipper has said, except that he has emphasized only the export end. The importation of products which we do not produce in this country is also necessarily an important factor to which the commercial attachés abroad lend their help.

I have come in personal contact abroad—I have done a lot of traveling, especially in the Latin American countries—with the commercial attachés and can testify to the very sincere and very helpful work that they do. They occupy a position in countries abroad which cannot be filled by any other agency of the Government. It cannot be filled, for instance, by the consuls because, although as a matter of law and theory a consul is not a diplomatic officer but a commercial representative of his country, nevertheless, as far as the general public atmosphere in those countries is concerned he is, in fact, looked upon as a representative of the foreign

office and not in any way as a commercial representative. The consul is handicapped by that fact in obtaining the information and giving the help that the commercial attachés can furnish; and it seems to me that it would be eminently desirable to extend the work and the status of the commercial attaché offices abroad and increase the number of commercial attachés.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask whether in your travels abroad, since you have indicated you have frequently had occasion to travel, you have found that foreign governments maintain abroad, and in the countries in which you have traveled, officials similar to trade commissioners?

Mr. EDER. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. As a matter of fact, there has been a very great expansion of that activity on the part of the Government of Great Britain, has there not?

Mr. EDER. Yes, sir; I understand so; and France also, and Germany at one time engaged very extensively in that work, and even some of the smaller countries. I have been surprised by the work that a country like Mexico is doing in other parts of Latin America.

I now wish to submit the following excerpts from Mr. Wallace Thompson's statement. His full statement may be found on pages 286, 287, 288, 289, and 290 of the hearings:

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, there are 18 associations that are members of the National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations. They are as follows:

Baltimore Export Managers Club, Export Managers Club of Chicago, Export Managers Club of St. Louis, the Foreign Trade Association of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Foreign Trade Club of Cincinnati, Foreign Trade Club of Newark, Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Houston Foreign Trade Club, Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Inc., Overseas Automotive Club (National), Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh Foreign Trade Council, Akron Chamber of Commerce, Northwest Foreign Trade Club (Minneapolis-St. Paul), Los Angeles Foreign Trade Association, Buffalo Export Club, Cleveland Export Club, Export Club of Detroit.

These clubs and associations represent, in a way, the "little fellows", the export managers of the whole country, as well as of those cities. These men are now trying to do a very large proportion of their work by mail and advertising and through contacts other than their own personal representatives or the representatives of great export companies. They make journeys through the foreign field from time to time, but they depend basically for the material with which they plan their campaigns upon the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. They have built the outside contacts of their companies through the Bureau; and the history of the Bureau, from Mr. Redfield down, is written in the books of these young and old—and all of them experienced—export managers in all parts of the country.

We have had contacts with these men ourselves, from New York, and always in the most delightful way; but in every case they have been coming to Washington rather than to New York for their introductions to foreign business men. They go abroad and come back enthusiastic over the service that has been given them. They are introduced to business men; they are given statistics; they get by word of mouth, in the field, from the commercial attachés and the trade commissioners, the names of possible representatives—things that cannot be put on paper—things that the State Department could not possibly touch.

They go to the field and they can get a service which gives them the opportunity to play the game on an equal footing with, first, Great Britain, and after that the lesser nations, and today, above all others, Japan. They have come to look upon the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as their spearhead. They know them as the persons who will come back to them with the information that they must have for planning their campaigns for going out and building this strong backbone, as it is, of our world commerce.

In other words, we are asking for the continuing help without which we cannot carry this banner of trade over the world. Trade has decreased all over the world in the last few years, of course, but today it is reviving. There are many indications of this revival.

We feel that the Bureau's service as it is progressing now has proven to be the right service, and is proof in very concrete form of the growing confidence that is going to make it possible for us to go forward in pushing foreign trade.

Mr. OLIVER. It occurs to me that the strength of this service has been, we must assume, that there has been care shown in the selection of men who were business men to perform this duty and who viewed it from a business standpoint. The Department is clothed with full authority at any time, when they have made a mistake in their selection of a man to carry on this work, to make a change at once.

I have felt that in matters where business problems are constantly changing, as we know they are and will continue, it is of the utmost importance that the business man be consulted as to whether those who are representing his interest in the collection of information, such as has been referred to, are really performing efficiently, and, if not, there should be absolutely no restraining influence of any kind, legal or otherwise, from making a change immediately and putting a man in who can do the work.

Mr. BACON. As a matter of fact, at this moment we are more in need of help from commercial attachés due to the increasing competition from Japan; is not that true?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir; that is very true.

I now quote from the statement of Mr. Eugene Thomas, who is probably one of the most widely known business men in the foreign field. Mr. Thomas' complete statement may be found on pages 290-295:

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had the pleasure of appearing before this committee on December 20, 1932, before the plans of the present administration were inaugurated, looking to the drastic curtailment of the services abroad of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Immediately those plans were announced as being in process of formulation, the various foreign-trade associations and organizations throughout the country began to make their wishes known in Washington and as a result of a questionnaire sent out by Secretary Roper, May 8, 1933, the organizations throughout the country unanimously signed a memorial in which they set forth their views as to the future organization and conduct of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, particularly with respect to its agencies abroad.

Since that time—and I may say parenthetically that a number of the recommendations made by these organizations jointly were followed, but the process of drastic curtailment went entirely too far, as a consequence of which the services have been seriously impaired and in the opinion of the foreign traders of the United States represented by these organizations are hopelessly inadequate on the present basis.

This continuing interest on the part of the foreign traders culminated again in March 1933 in a great convention in Pittsburgh, at which resolutions were adopted and forwarded to the various departments and administrations along the same lines.

These activities also continued to a point where memorials were addressed to the President of the United States in June of this year, signed by many foreign-trade organizations.

This particular subject, therefore, has been a continuing one, of intense interest to all of these organizations, to the extent that it has formed at monthly meetings the chief topic of conversation or discussion in New York.

I should like to have for the record the names of these organizations, including those represented here by Mr. Tipper and Mr. Thompson. Mr. Tipper represents the American Manufacturers Export Association; Mr. Thompson, the National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations, among the leading organizations throughout the country. In addition to these, this joint committee for foreign-trade action, which I have referred to, represents the National Foreign Trade Council; the American Japanese Trade Council; the American Chinese Trade Council; the Council on Inter-American Relations; the Export Managers Club of New York, an organization of over 400 exporting firms; the National Association of Credit Men; the National Council of American Importers and Traders; the World Trade League of the United States; and the Textile Export Association of the United States.

Representatives of these various organizations gathered on last Friday in New York and this subject was considered of so much importance that we immediately telephoned to Washington in an effort to obtain from you, Mr. Chairman, if practicable, an extension of time so that representatives from all over the country could appear before this committee to submit the necessary detailed memorials. We found the time not sufficient and therefore we three have been delegated to come down to represent this joint foreign-trade community.

The exporters of this country believe that they, as taxpayers, are entitled to the same sort of representation that they had in previous years; and, moreover, there is a wide-spread belief that this would not cost the Government anything additional, because it has been proved, or is capable of proof, that the actual assistance rendered by the representatives of the Bureau abroad has been reflected in such increased volume of business that the profits on that volume of business, reflected in the taxes collected by the Government, are many, many times greater than necessary to compensate for the outlay of the Government in providing these facilities abroad. It is simply a question of dollars and cents. If we can restore, in any part, the \$3,000,000,000 of export trade alone that we have lost, and which is capable of restoration with proper representation abroad, both by governmental agents and by the firms themselves, the profits on that business will be reflected to a degree which will make any large increase in the present appropriation more than justified in returns into the coffers of the Government.

Mr. BACON. An increase in our foreign trade to the point where it was in 1929 or 1930 would restore a great many thousand people back to work in this country, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS. It would restore many. Mr. Tipper had an estimate of the number of people who are affected by our volume of foreign trade, which I should be glad if he would present to you.

Mr. TIPPER. We prepared for the National Industrial Conference Board meeting the other day the results of an examination of the dependency of employment on foreign trade. We have had various calculations on employment, some of which have dealt specifically with those who are actually in export organizations or on docks that were actually moving export goods, but nothing has been done to indicate the real dependency on foreign trade.

For instance, we called attention to the fact that the State of Texas, which exports 90 percent of its cotton crop, normally has over 3,000,000 people dependent upon foreign trade for their livelihood; 1,700,000 people in the rural sections and approximately 1,500,000 in the urban sections whose livelihood would be lost if that trade were eliminated.

Mr. McMILLAN. Let me interrupt to ask, is that not true to greater or lesser extent throughout the Cotton Belt?

Mr. TIPPER. It is true throughout the country. We exhibited a map before the Senate Finance Committee last year which showed that every State in the Union has an interest in foreign trade. We showed the extent of that interest in dollars. The conclusion is that there is not a single State in this country that is not dependent to some extent upon foreign trade for its employment.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the total of the figures that you show as to the dependency on foreign trade for employment?

Mr. TIPPER. The dependency on export, the total figures are 3,000,000 on the farms, 1,300,000 in industry, and 7,000,000 in trade, transportation, and supplementary services—over 7,000,000 people, workers, not families.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to go on from that point and say that that represents merely exports. But the interest of this administration has been clearly expressed frequently in the necessity of increasing imports, to carry out its policies and to compensate not only for our existing volume of exports but for the increased volume which is expected to result from the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements and from the export-import banks and other agencies which are being set up by the Government.

Adequate attention has not been given to the information which is properly necessary to be supplied in foreign countries to enable that expansion of imports into this country which is absolutely necessary if the policies of this administration are to be carried out and we are to have that degree of balancing of trade which will not necessitate the continued extension of very large foreign loans abroad, to compensate for the excess balance of exports over imports.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the comment of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] about the sale of black bass in the Capitol restaurant, I am pleased to assure him that I have made an investigation and have found that the black bass served in the House restaurant are not the large-mouthed black bass of fresh waters in which the disciple of Izaak Walton is so much interested, but are black sea bass, a salt-water fish, which, under the law, can be sold legally.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then they should take off the menu in the restaurant the description "Potomac bass", because there is no salt water where those bass are found in the Potomac River. Bass of that kind do not come out of salt water; I have caught too many of them for the gentleman to tell me that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was told that by the manager of the House restaurant; that the sale of Potomac black bass was illegal. He assured me these came from Chesapeake Bay; that these were black sea bass.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the menu he will see that it reads "Potomac black bass"; and if he will look at them he will find they are fresh-water bass.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the conference committee increase the amount for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; the President submitted a Budget estimate for \$143,000 plus, and that has been approved.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is for the Foreign Service, and I am delighted; but was the amount increased for the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. OLIVER. Only the Bureau of Standards, which is under Mr. Dickinson. The appropriation for the Bureau of Standards was increased by \$30,000, and the House conferees concurred in that. That, however, is within the estimate originally submitted by the Budget. Our committee increased the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce \$30,000, which the House approved. The Senate approved the House increase.

The bill for the four departments as now reported is \$1,376,757 under the original Budget estimates.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report. The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the filing and printing of the views of the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Senate bill 267, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address delivered by me on the subject of old-age pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered March 17, 1935, on the subject of the Old-Age Pensions:

Good evening, my fellow Americans, the Roosevelt administration and the Seventy-fourth Congress are definitely committed to a sane and reasonable system of old-age pensions. It has been said that President Roosevelt was running on every ballot in the Nation last November. You will remember that candidates everywhere during the last election, seeking offices from the United States Senate down to constable, exploited a platform which favored a system of old-age pensions. There have been many social-security bills introduced in the present session of Congress. Most of these proposals have been either so fantastic in their generosity to the aged or so ultraconservative and pinchpenny that the noble purpose would be defeated by their enactment. But now the first blush of excitement for something too opulent and far too radical has subsided into a saner demand for a reasonable, just, and equitable method of providing a program, not spectacular but a program that will redound good of a lasting and permanent nature for the aged people of this Nation.

I have the honor of having introduced in the present Congress the first measure dealing with old-age pensions. You may be sure that I am not an egotist who thinks that mine is the only plan. But because of the universal acclaim that my proposal has received I beg leave to discuss with you briefly the outstanding tenets of my measure. First, however, let me explain that my bill, H. R. 2856, has the endorsement of the National Old-Age Pension Association. Dr. J. E. Pope is president of this organization. He has done a wonderful work in creating favorable sentiment for security legislation. He has been tireless in his efforts and deserves universal acclaim for his work. My bill provides that all citizens of the United States over the age of 55 years shall receive \$30 per month, provided they are not engaged in the field of competitive earning.

If a citizen of the United States who has been a resident of this country for 20 years is unemployed or does not have sufficient income to maintain himself, he would be entitled to receive \$30 per month from the Federal Government. This plan does not require the cooperation of the various States. Most of them are unable to assume any additional burdens, so this proposal is confined to the Federal Government. My bill also provides that any citizen of the United States above the age of 21 years, who is physically or mentally unable to earn his living, would receive \$30 per month. Necessary funds would be provided by a levy of 1½ percent on all earnings of persons between the ages of 21 and 45 years. The plan calls for an appropriation of \$250,000,000 to initiate the program. I have drafted amendments, to be submitted when the bill is considered on the floor of the House, which propose to pension persons between the ages of 60 and 65 in the amount of \$40 per month, and persons over the age of 65, \$50 per month.

President Roosevelt has submitted an old-age-pension plan to Congress that calls for a maximum of \$15 per month to citizens over 65 years of age, with a method of State participation. Numerous States have indicated that their financial condition will not permit this cooperation. I am not opposed to President Roosevelt's old-age-pension plan. It is a great step forward, but it does not go far enough. It represents the most conservative plan of social security. It is good and desirable as far as it goes, but the fact remains that it is inadequate. It does not make ample provisions for social security. It would be discriminatory in its effects with the aged of the various States. It does not provide for our elderly people until the beginning of the fiscal

year 1936. The State legislatures would have to meet and make appropriations to match all or any part of the \$15 Federal fund. At best, it would be late 1936 or 1937 before our needy aged could realize the benefits of the administration's program. What we need is an equitable, reasonable Federal system of old-age pension now.

Since I introduced H. R. 2856 last January 3, I have received millions of signatures to petitions from people in every State in the Union urging immediate congressional action on my bill. You can look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any day and find listed, under the heading of "Petitions", page after page where people by the thousands and millions are sending me petitions favoring this bill. The mere listing of these by town and county requires from 3 to 9 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day. The number of petitions favoring this plan of old-age pensions exceeds by far those received on all other legislation combined. It is phenomenal that this proposal has such wide-spread acclaim. It is looked upon as a plan that is conservative enough to satisfy those who would protect the Federal Treasury and progressive enough to meet the demands of social security. It takes a middle course.

Old-age pensions was once considered a wild, radical scheme. Those who were bold enough to advocate pensions for our aged were met with distrust and suspicion of their fellow men. No longer does this hold true. No longer do we undertake to condone the philosophy of these lines:

In savage tribes where skulls are thick
And primal passions rage,
They have a system sure and quick
To cure the blight of age.
For when a native's youth has fled
And years have snapped his vim,
They simply knocked him on the head
And put an end to him.
But we of this enlightened age
Are built of sterner stuff,
And so we look with righteous rage
On deed so harsh and rough.
For when a man grows old and gray
And weak and short of breath,
We simply take his job away
And let him starve to death.

Ludicrous as these lines may seem, we are faced with the fact that they contain what has been our principle of social economy in the past. Today we all recognize the need for an adequate system of old-age pensions. Embodied in H. R. 2856 a far-reaching humane plan of national old-age pensions is a schedule that will provide security for the aged, and at the same time will add no hardship to the tax-paying public. It is another way to spread the wealth of this Nation. It is an open road to happiness and contentment in old age. Since Congress is pledged to enact some system of old-age security, and since the President is committed on this problem, I feel that the adoption of my proposal will aid in breaking the depression, will help us to be our brother's keeper, will make us remember the forgotten man, and will serve as an effective supplement to the program already initiated by the Roosevelt administration.

COTTON CONTROL

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6424), to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6424) to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this bill is composed of amendments to the so-called "Bankhead bill." It does three things: First, it exempts the producer, whether owner, share cropper, or tenant, who has been producing cotton and who has a base production of less than 2 bales, the amount of his production this year to be not to exceed 2 bales; second, it provides an appeal board consisting of a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General, and the secretary of agriculture of each cotton State, to which board appeals may be made of disputes relative to decisions of county committees; third, it provides a compensation for the ginners of 25 cents per bale.

We have endeavored to get figures as to the amount of increase that would be allowed by virtue of the 2-bale exemption. It has been impossible to get accurate figures. The Department has taken the base production in five States of those who made 2 bales or less and assumed that the same ratio applied in other States, and on this basis have estimated that there are 518,000 farmers who have allotted or who have a base production of 2 bales or less.

It is probably fair to assume, according to the figures which they have, that the average production which they have in those 518,000 will be about $1\frac{1}{3}$ bales; so the only possible increase would be the other two-thirds of a bale for those who produce this year an amount in addition to the average production which they had heretofore. Those figures assume that every one of them would produce the full 2 bales. There would be a possible additional allotment for those who had a little above 2 bales who by virtue of the reduction program would be reduced below 2 bales. There are 418,000, I think it is estimated, who produce between 2 and 3 bales. Some of those in their actual allotment this year would be reduced below 2 bales. They would get an additional possible production in order to bring them up to the 2 bales. That has been estimated by various individuals at about 117,000 bales. I take it the only possible addition, the way this is worked out, would be probably between 400,000 and 500,000 bales. This is assuming that our estimates as to the number of farmers is correct.

The Department estimates that the increase would be greater than I have estimated. I include at the end of my speech the estimates of the Department.

The Department is authorized under the bill to fix the allotment for this year. That can be absorbed in the regular allotment, or added to it, depending on the attitude of the Department. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Members interested in this measure, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. If these small producers produce say 400,000 bales more than they would under the allotment, will that be taken away from the large producers, or will it be just so much more cotton produced?

Mr. JONES. That will depend on the total baleage fixed by the Department.

Mr. SNELL. I thought we had fixed that at 10,000,000 bales?

Mr. JONES. That was the first year. The second year it was to be fixed by the Department, based on existing conditions.

Mr. SNELL. They may do anything they like?

Mr. JONES. Yes; of course, those figures are not accurate. The Department estimates it would be a little more than that, but I am giving the best I can under the circumstances.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us the total number of cotton growers?

Mr. JONES. Yes; approximately—about 2,400,000.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us about how many bales of cotton are now being produced?

Mr. JONES. I can give the gentleman the figures for last year and for a series of years, if he wishes that information. I can also give him the carry-over. The production for the season 1933-34 was 13,047,000. For the season just passed, 1934-35, the production was 9,731,000 bales.

Mr. TABER. How much of each year's production was exported?

Mr. JONES. I have not the figures accurately. The exports from the United States for the season 1933-34 were 7,534,000 bales. We do not have those figures complete for the 1934-35 season. I have that somewhere in my papers however. I may say it is much less this year than last year.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman estimate about 4,000,000 bales?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not think there was that much. You understand that there was a drought in a great stretch of the cotton country, and the exportations for this past season were comparatively small. I do not know exactly what it was. I have it somewhere in my papers. However, it was comparatively small this last year.

Mr. TABER. Were the 1934-35 figures above or below the allotment?

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman mean the export figure or the production figure?

Mr. TABER. No; I refer to the allotment figure.

Mr. JONES. The total carry-over of American cotton was reduced last year.

Mr. TABER. And the production was below the allotment or above?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The production was a few hundred thousand below.

Mr. TABER. What is expected this year in the way of allotments?

Mr. JONES. I believe the Department has set a tentative figure that the allotment will be 10,500,000 running bales plus the outstanding certificates, which, as I recall, are around 400,000. Those figures are all approximate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman the figure for the present carry-over?

Mr. JONES. Yes. For 1934-35 the carry-over of American cotton in America on August 1, which was the beginning of the season, was 7,647,000 bales, and the American cotton in world trade was 10,634,000.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I understood the chairman of the committee to say that it is the purpose of the committee by this bill to allow the exemption to every producer of cotton whether he be the owner of land, a tenant, or share-cropper, and to give him the privilege of marketing two bales of cotton exempt from the tax.

Mr. JONES. True, if he has been and is a producer of cotton. It would not give the privilege to new men unless they came under the terms of the original act.

Mr. TARVER. It seems to me the language of section 2 is difficult of construction, and I doubt if the Department of Agriculture would definitely and clearly construe this language as effectuating the gentleman's purpose and the committee's purpose. If that is true, would the gentleman or the committee have any objection to clarifying that section in order to make clear the purpose?

Mr. JONES. If the object is to clarify and not complicate some of the other language, there would be no objection. I may say that we had the best cotton men in the country go over this bill, and they think there is no doubt about the language.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Number of cotton growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less, and between 2 and 3 bales during 1928 to 1933, in 1934 for selected States with an estimate for the entire Cotton Belt (From 1934 Bankhead applications, on basis of 478-pound bales)

State (1)	2 bales or less (2)	Between 2 and 3 bales (3)	3 bales or less (col. 3) 2+col. 3 (4)
Alabama.....	61,895	49,515	111,410
Arkansas.....	33,833	32,897	66,730
New Mexico.....	260	314	574
North Carolina.....	56,624	30,779	87,403
Oklahoma.....	30,907	32,940	63,847
Tennessee.....	22,936	19,733	42,669
Total.....	206,475	166,178	372,653
Estimate for entire Cotton Belt ¹	518,781	417,532	936,314
Estimated average production ²	518,781	1,043,830	1,922,611
1935 allotment, assuming 35 percent reduction. Plus 103,000 bales allowed for making allotments as regulations now read in determining the national allotment of 10.5 million.	337,208	678,460	1,015,668
Estimated requirements for making allotments by proposed plan ³			1,118,668
Necessary increase in allotment.....	1,037,562	835,064	1,872,626
			783,958

¹ Assuming that the same relationship for small producers as compared to the number of applications exists in the remainder of the Cotton Belt.

² Assuming one bale as average for the group included in two bales or less.

³ Granting two bales to each producer unit falling in the two groups.

The two groups above do not include the 1934 Bankhead applications covering farms on which cotton was grown in 1934 for the first time since 1927, a large percentage of which fall in the two groups. There were approximately 75,000 such applications on which it is estimated there were about 60,000 producer units growing less than 3 bales and would increase the 753,958 bales to 850,000 bales.

It is estimated that the producer units omitted from applications in 1934 and the increase in 1935 of the number of producer units would easily increase the draw upon the national allotment to from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 bales.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement through which the pending legislation became privileged, it was agreed the first section of the bill concerning the extension of the processing taxes for an additional year will be eliminated. I believe this is good judgment, as it will not complicate the situation. The poor tenant farmer of the South, who has suffered untold hardships and misery through the curtailment program will not be forced to carry on his back the extension of the law. That can be considered later and on its own merits.

With the section eliminated, I recognize the urgency and the need for the prompt passage of the legislation. Hundreds of thousands of cotton farmers, that class for which the American people have the most sympathy, have been pushed into dire distress through the operations of the curtailment program. These small farmers, whose total income from cotton production would be only \$120 a year, have been obliged to bear additional burdens. Think of it: Placing increased burdens on a people who find it almost impossible to obtain the bare necessities of life, and whose greatest worry last fall was to obtain the needed cotton cloth, that their children might be enabled to go to school. I am reliably informed six or seven thousand families in Alabama alone were in that situation last September. Only an appeal to the relief officials solved their problem. J. S. Wannamaker, of South Carolina, president of the Cotton Growers' Association, has stated the curtailment program forced 40 percent of the cotton growers onto the relief rolls. Certainly it must be evident to anyone there can be no recovery in this country through a law which operates in this manner.

I am for the amendments which would eliminate the two-bale tenant farmer from the tax, even if the Department is reported to look with disfavor on the proposal. It is absurd to think of taxing a cotton grower whose income is \$120 a year, or \$180 a year. It is like going to the poorhouse and taking up a collection for charity. What if the large grower does find he is hit a little through the relief given to the small growers? He must expect to make some contribution to the task of rescuing the submerged millions in his own neighborhood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman believe that Congress might well go further and exempt four bales rather than only two bales?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Personally, I would think that four bales of cotton is a small enough amount, because, after all, what is \$240 a year to the small cotton growers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I have an amendment prepared which will do that very thing.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I want to state to the gentleman that in my district farmers who produce a bale of cotton were cut down by the Department of Agriculture to as low as 250 pounds of cotton, and this was not just one instance, but occurred in numerous instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not subscribe to regulation of that character. I know how it has already affected the South. I know the misery it has brought to many people.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides for the exemption of two bales of cotton to every cotton farmer who came within the purview of the act of last year?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would not want to answer that question because I do not know just who did come under the act of last year.

Mr. NICHOLS. If he did come under the act of last year his two bales of cotton will be exempt under this bill, will it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would prefer that the gentleman address his question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES. That is correct; it affects his production this year up to that amount.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman believe that it would be far wiser for Congress to provide a domestic allotment plan giving to the farmers direct out of the Treasury a subsidy and enable us to hold and maintain the markets of the world for our cotton producers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, and a little later I hope to approach that subject more in detail.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. EAGLE. I am very pleased to have the assistance of my colleague from Texas, and I may refer to the fact that 2 months ago I introduced a domestic-cotton allotment bill and shortly we will have open hearings and I want everybody to help us perfect that measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not concerned about any opposition that the large cotton grower may have to the legislation that is pending here today. I think the large cotton growers should be willing to make some contribution to the welfare of these submerged millions, particularly when they live in their own part of the country.

We have a great problem to solve as to cotton. All of us are interested in a proper solution, whether we represent cotton growers, cotton spinners, or the consumers. We must not act too hastily. The ablest business men of this country are trying to reach a just solution. That is why it would have been ridiculous to try to give the verdict in a 2-hour Saturday afternoon discussion, with the main proposal tied up as a rider on a relief bill for the poor tenant farmer.

I am neither sectional nor partisan in my consideration of this problem. The cotton grower and the cotton spinner, whether they be in the North or the South, have a common bond of interest. It is decidedly to the benefit of each that the other shall be prosperous. If the cotton grower obtains a fair price for his cotton, he will be prosperous and he will have the purchasing power that will materially contribute to the activity of the cotton spinner. If the price is too high, beyond the figure which the consumer will pay, there will be a lessened demand and the grower and spinner alike will suffer.

If the cotton spinner is unduly penalized, if he is forced out of business, the grower loses a home customer which he will never replace. If the price is forced beyond a figure which will permit the export trade, there is sure to be an economic crisis in the South because more than half of the cotton grown has in the past found its way to foreign countries.

The foreign trade is seriously threatened. This notwithstanding the fact that it is generally recognized the best cotton in the world is grown in the South. It has more character than the cotton of India or Brazil; it permits greater efficiency in operation. All this may well be true, and yet it will be found price will be a determining factor in export trade.

Japan, Greece, and Yugoslavia are trying to produce cotton in a small way. Great Britain, Belgium, and Italy are giving their encouragement to the production of cotton in

their colonial empires in Asia and Africa. Japan is stimulating cotton growing in Manchukuo and Korea. Brazil dreams of a cotton empire which will be larger than that now in the South. With these movements throughout the world, the United States must move cautiously if cotton is to maintain its traditional place in American life.

We cannot play too lightly with the economic future of millions of our countrymen. It is all right to try experiments, it is all right to give subsidies, but no experiment should be attempted unless it is thought clear through. And if it be demonstrated the experiment helps only a few and places an impossible burden on many millions of our people, we should be frank enough to admit failure and try some other method of giving relief.

I am for relief for the cotton farmer. I believe he is entitled to aid, but I want that relief given in such a way it will not bring disaster to millions of other people and in the end bring destruction to the cotton grower himself.

I am not for letting a few theorists in the Department of Agriculture make this decision. I believe this great problem could be solved in a more equitable way if we invite leading cotton growers, cotton spinners, representatives of the consumers, outstanding business men of the country, to come here and discuss this problem in a judicial way, with the one thought in mind of what is best for the country.

If we did this, we would get legislation which would give some promise of solution and would make a real contribution to recovery. This method of just getting the testimony of a representative of the Department of Agriculture, who is probably most concerned in building up the numerical strength of his division, and then reporting out what he wants after a perfunctory discussion, is not going to solve a problem of this magnitude. It is not going to rescue the American people from poverty and distress.

During the last 2 days representatives of the cotton-spinning industry from all sections of the country have been gathered here in Washington. They have come to see if plans could be devised which would save their industry from the threatened destruction.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Do not the figures show that our exports of cotton are rapidly declining every month in comparison with the consumption of foreign cotton?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The facts show the gentleman is correct. The distress in the cotton-spinning industry is most acute.

One large mill in North Carolina has recently closed its doors. A large mill in Georgia is facing a similar fate within a few weeks. Another large mill in Georgia, for the first time in its history, saw red figures appear last July. Since that day, every month has seen similar red figures. It is one of the best-managed mills in the South, and is known to pay wages 15 percent higher than most southern mills, yet it cannot live under present conditions. Mills in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Alabama, and South Carolina are similarly threatened. It is not a local menace, but one Nation-wide in its scope, embracing every part of the country.

It is a real peril, and the President of the United States is the one man who can help the most. I hope he will not permit an industry to perish, an industry which directly employs 500,000 persons and which indirectly provides a livelihood for several million additional families.

The cotton grower of the South is vitally concerned with the peril of his best customer. It is no profit to him to see this home market steadily slipping. If foreign competition becomes acute, he will need more than ever the home market, and it is to his interest that it be maintained.

The processing tax has been a burden which the textile industry has not been able to pass along to the consumer except in few instances. In theory the consumer was expected to pay the entire bill, but with the purchasing power of the masses actually less this year than last year, it has not been possible to pass the tax along.

There was reached in many instances a price which could not be exceeded without stifling demand or else losing the

market to substitutes. Consequently an industry which has been stripped of its reserve surpluses through years of adversity has found itself fettered with unbearable taxes to pay for the relief of cotton growers.

The cotton grower should be given his relief. I am for this, but I say it is manifestly unfair to drain the lifeblood of one industry to pay the bill of what is distinctly a national problem. Not only is it unfair but unwise as well. If you rescue one group at the cost of the destruction of a larger group, you have not made any progress toward recovery.

Much more sensible would it be to give the cotton grower his relief directly from the Treasury or, at least, widen the base of the assessments to the end that no one would be ruined.

If this processing tax was shifted from the cotton industry, jobs would be available for thousands of more people. No greater relief contribution could be made than to put more people back to work in private employment at real wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are not our textile industries being placed in jeopardy by imports from Japan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. It is a serious threat, and if the deluge continues there will be very little of the textile industry left in this country.

I believe the one man who can help us is the President of the United States, and I hope he will do so. He can arrest these tremendous importations from Japan coming into this country every day and depriving the American people of the opportunity to work that belongs to them.

Last year there was imported from that country 7,000,000 square yards of cotton goods. In the month of January 5,000,000 square yards were imported and as much more on the 1st day of February alone. All that has caused loss of employment to American workers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The figures show that in 1933, 1,700,000 square yards of cotton cloth were imported from Japan. In 1934, 7,700,000 square yards, and in January 1935, 7,000,000 square yards; in February 1935, 12,000,000 square yards; and on March 1, that day alone, 5,000,000; making a total of 24,000,000 square yards to date in this year, over three times the total in 1934, and many times more than the total of 1933.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. The full extent of the peril is obvious to anyone who investigates the subject. It is obvious to the workers who daily see their opportunity to earn a living by honest toil being taken from them.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I interrupt to state that the gentleman in his broad approach to this subject affords a good example to the Members of the House in dealing with a great economic problem at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No one is more interested than I am in solving this problem. That is why I am glad it is going to be delayed so we can approach the subject in an intelligent and honest way. It is too great a national problem to try to solve in 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CITRON. Our textile exports have decreased in the last 5 years from almost a billion dollars to about \$400,000,000. This whole textile situation is a matter not only for the manufacturers, but for the cotton growers, and is a complicated matter. Many of our factories are leaving this country because of various reasons. I have introduced a bill which provides for a study of the whole situation, and I hope the gentleman will come to the support of my bill so that we can get all of the facts.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Connecticut is mistaken. Our exports are six times as much as the gentleman gives them. Has the gentleman any information as to where the cotton that Japanese cloth is made of comes from? I understand that it comes from India.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A great deal of it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no.

Mr. KNUTSON. Those are the facts. And the records will show that Japan is putting in a big acreage in Manchukuo and will be independent of American cotton in 3 years.

Mr. DIES. And is not the cause of the increase in the importation of cotton from Japan due to the depreciation in the yen?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Also, labor gets only 20 to 22 cents a day in Japan.

Mr. DIES. But the yen has been steadily falling.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the labor lives on rice, and it does not cost much money to buy rice in Japan.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. May I state for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts that in addition to the great amount of finished cotton goods now being annually imported into our country, to which reference has just been made by our friend and colleague [Mr. McCORMACK], that many thousands of bales are also annually imported for manufacturing purposes directly in competition with our own cotton. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has just recently supplied me with some statistics in this connection which are most impressive. For instance, in 1932 there were 104,000 bales imported; 1933, 146,000 bales; 1934, 144,000 bales. It seems to me that some policy should be immediately adopted to prevent, if possible, the importation of cotton grown in foreign countries, if our farmers and the cotton industry are to be protected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Our task today is a simple one. Let us give relief to the tenant farmers. God knows no one will deny him his humble place in life or want to make it worse. Let us delay action on the extension of the life of this experiment. Then let us all get together and forget about the department brain trusters and see if we cannot work out relief for the cotton grower which will give him a chance to save both his home and foreign markets, and at the same time not bring about the destruction of his best customers, the cotton spinners, both North and South.

It is one of the gravest problems before the American Government today and worthy of the most serious consideration. Certainly, as the law now stands, it gives a very minimum of relief and is slowly but steadily strangling the cotton spinner and the small cotton grower, and eventually will ruin the South. The problem should be approached in a genuine patriotic way, with a realization all have a right to live and the country advances though all being prosperous. [Applause.]

Mr. DONDERO. How many bales of cotton are we importing from abroad now?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from South Carolina stated 144,000 bales.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, knowing full well the interest of those who have the welfare of the cotton South at heart, and especially the Members of this body who by their words and acts have expressed themselves in favor of a better and more equitable administration of the present Cotton Control Act, better known as the Bankhead Law, I desire to express my sincere appreciation to each and every one who has made it possible, over much opposition, for us to be able to consider my bill (H. R. 6424) at this time.

Realizing that quite a number of you have already requested time to discuss this bill together with the fact that our time is limited, it will not be my purpose to dwell upon conditions of the cotton producer, the nature of complaints in regard to the administration of the act last year, or the reasons that prompted me to introduce this bill and do all that I could thus far to have it enacted into a law. The hearings before our full committee for several days, then the time and study given it by our subcommittee, and the general developments, are partially reflected in the printed hearings on this bill to which I invite your careful consideration.

Some rather unusual things have transpired since February 12, 1935, the day I introduced the original bill (H. R. 5578), which has been the basis of our consideration and is amended by this bill (H. R. 6424). The Secretary of Agriculture since then has issued quite a number of regulations and proposed rules looking forward this year to a better and more equitable administration of the present Cotton Control Act. In my humble judgment, however, he has not yet gone far enough and has not yet set up the right administrative machinery to do the job properly or to give the relief that I feel the cotton producer, who should be classed as owner, tenant, and share-cropper, is entitled to. I am afraid that unless we enact definite and specific legislation, clearly expressing that it is the intent of Congress that the small farmer, including the tenant and share-cropper, is to be given some of the "breaks", so to speak, he—the small producer, owner, tenant, and share-cropper—will find that in the administration of the act this year he will fare about as he did last year.

We want to better his condition and give him at least a 2-bale exemption tax free this year, providing he raises that much.

We also want an appeal board to whom any producer of cotton, feeling that his county committee has not given him his full share of cotton allotment tax free, can appeal his case, present his claim, and procure relief if he is entitled to it. We want and expect each allotment to each individual farmer to be made public.

We also want the ginner paid out of the funds set aside to administer this act, a reasonable fee for the extra trouble and expense they are put to in ginning the cotton and making their report in regard thereto.

We further feel that some of the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture last year should be changed, and that the cotton farmer should be permitted to express himself this fall, as he did last year, as to whether he desires a continuation of some form of cotton-production control next year.

Permit me here to remind you and to earnestly warn you that there are some powerful influences against this bill, as well as against any legislation, whatsoever, dealing with our cotton situation. They do not want us to legislate at all in our efforts to benefit the cotton farmer. They would like to see this bill amended so as to wreck it, and in fact to destroy the entire cotton program that has been of such great benefit thus far to the cotton farmer. Do not be deceived and vote for amendments that will kill the bill. To load it down with amendments or to materially change it, means no legislation at all in this regard at this session of Congress, and will make matters more and more complicated when we try to legislate on the subject next session.

Some of us know of the efforts of the opposition. We all have within the last few days seen unmistakable evidences of the plan to demoralize the efforts of this administration, and to bring about a radical change of policy by propaganda and by otherwise arousing and poisoning the minds of the people. Everything is being done to counteract the great relief thus far given agriculture by this administration. There is a well-organized and powerful influence doing effective work in breaking the cotton market. The recent downward trend and violent break in the price of cotton, whereby cotton declined in a single day nearly 2 cents per pound, is positive proof of what the manipulators, speculators, and

cotton-market gamblers are trying to do and what they can do.

Recently I introduced a bill (H. R. 5367) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in cotton by regulating transactions on cotton-futures exchanges, and for other purposes, which, in my judgment, will go a long way toward remedying such a disastrous situation.

Our Committee on Agriculture has given much time and thought to this proposition, and on March 14 voted to report out of the committee favorably H. R. 6772, "To amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity-futures exchanges, and for other purposes", which includes the principles set forth in my bill H. R. 5367 with reference to regulating cotton transactions on the cotton-futures exchanges. In other words, H. R. 6772 amends the Grain Futures Act by including cotton as a commodity, which has never heretofore been in any wise regulated as to transactions on futures exchanges, which bill we hope will soon be enacted into a law.

In the well-organized scheme to pound down the price of cotton and in other ways to discredit and thwart the efforts of the Roosevelt administration, all kinds of false rumors are being published and disseminated throughout the land, not only in this country but also in foreign countries, in an effort to bring about a lower price at the expense of the Government, which is now holding several million bales of farmer cotton, and at a great loss to the cotton farmers of this country.

Our enemies have said and published that this administration was going to change and even abandon its loan and crop-restriction policies with reference to cotton. Special mention was made of the Doxey bill (H. R. 6424) that we are now considering.

It was charged that as the Rules Committee of the House had given a rule on the Doxey bill and that bill would have the right-of-way, there would certainly be an increase in cotton production this year if the bill should be enacted into law. Nothing is further from the truth. The Doxey bill in no wise changes or increases the total present allotment to the entire country or to any cotton-producing State or county. It simply changes the method of distributing the same total allotment of cotton. It permits the little cotton producer to grow and sell more cotton tax free and requires the big grower to produce and sell less tax-exempt cotton.

I do not believe the Members of this House or the country at large will be deceived by any such false and extensive propaganda that is now flooding the country.

The situation is serious, our responsibilities are grave. Are we going forward or backward? The fate of this particular bill, so far as this House is concerned, is in your hands. The friends of this measure have brought it to you, wide open, so to speak. Any amendment that is germane is in order. If we can strengthen and better the bill by amending it, I am for amendments. If not, I am against them. Let us make the best bill possible and pass it today.

Would that I had the time to give you certain facts and figures in regard to this cotton situation as it exists today and to take this bill up section by section and analyze it and give you the reasons therefor. Time will not permit a detailed explanation. My printed report (No. 335) on this bill is an effort to give a comprehensive and concise explanation of the bill as amended by the committee.

The original bill, H. R. 5578, that I introduced is as follows:

A bill to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the second and third sentences of section 2 and the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved April 21, 1934, as amended, are amended by inserting after the phrase "the crop year 1935—

36", wherever such phrase appears, the phrase "or the crop year 1936-37."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton (on his behalf as share-cropper or tenant) is less than two bales for the crop year 1935-36, there shall be exempt from the tax imposed under this act so much of the cotton harvested on such land during such crop year as is in excess of the allotment but not in excess of two bales. No producer shall be entitled to exemption certificates on the amount of cotton exempt from tax under this subsection, but, upon proof of the right to exemption under this subsection in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, bale tags shall be issued for such cotton. For the crop year 1935-36, the quantity of cotton allotted under section 3 (a) shall include the amount which the Secretary of Agriculture estimates will be tax-exempt under this subsection and the amount of cotton apportioned under section 3 (b) shall be the amount so allotted minus the amount of tax-exempt cotton so estimated."

(b) Section 23 of such act, as amended (relating to the definition of "bale"), is amended by inserting after "3", in the last sentence thereof "4 (h)."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such act, as amended (relating to allotments to producers) is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish, as soon as practicable, in each State a board to be known as the 'Allotment Appeals Board', which shall consist of a representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary, and, with the consent of the State, the attorney general of the State or a person designated by him, and the secretary of agriculture of the State or a person designated by him.

"(2) Subject to such rules and regulations as the Allotment Appeals Board may prescribe relating to the time, place, and manner of hearing and disposing of appeals, any producer of cotton or any share-cropper or tenant who has been granted an allotment by, or whose application for an allotment has been denied by, the county committee, may appeal to such Appeals Board from the action of the county committee. The Appeals Board shall consider such appeal and, on the basis of the law and facts, shall affirm, modify, or set aside the action of the county committee. The decision of the Appeals Board shall be final and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make provision for carrying out such final decisions.

"(3) The members of the Appeals Board shall be allowed compensation at the rate of \$5 per day while actually engaged in the work of the Board, except that the representative of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be paid such compensation as the Secretary may fix. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Appeals Board may appoint such clerical and stenographic assistants as may be necessary and may incur such expenses as may be necessary. An itemized statement of salaries and other expenses so incurred shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture at such time as he may require and shall, when allowed by him, be paid out of moneys available for administrative expenses under this act.

"(c) The allotment to each producer in each county for the crop year 1935-36 shall be made public either by posting on the bulletin board of the courthouse in that county, or by publication once in a newspaper of general circulation within the county, the name, address, and amount of allotment to each producer."

SEC. 4. Section 9 (d) of such act, as amended (relating to transfer of exemption certificates), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No rule or regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture shall prohibit the transfer or assignment by a cotton producer of certificates issued or reissued by him to another cotton producer who is a resident of the same State."

SEC. 5. Section 17 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to pay any person, who, in connection with the operation of any cotton gin, was obliged to collect tax imposed under this act on any cotton harvested during the crop year 1934-35 or during the crop year 1935-36, and who applies to the Secretary therefor, compensation for the collection of such tax at the rate of 25 cents per bale of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion) for collecting the tax on each such bale."

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit me to discuss the merits or the demerits of the Bankhead bill. The amendments proposed in my bill are what I shall endeavor to explain to you, and how they will work if we adopt them. My good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, has just made a most interesting and illuminating speech with reference to conditions in New England regarding the processing tax. It does not bear on this bill at all. Out of deference for these people here and in view of the fact that we wanted to expedite the passage of this important measure, as time is the essence, we agreed to eliminate, for the present at least, section 1 of the bill H. R. 6424, which I introduced,

and therefore we will not discuss whether or not the Bankhead Act shall be continued or whether the people at this time shall have the opportunity to vote. With section 1 of the bill for the present eliminated by agreement for the purposes I have outlined, what does section 2 do? Section 2, in as clear language as we were able to express, provides that the two-bale farmer—and the farmer is to be classed as owner, sharecropper, and tenant—is to be given an exemption of two bales of cotton, provided he raises that much, if he has any allotment at all coming to him. That is section 2 of my bill, and that is all it is. I am for anything that will better the bill, and I hope that we will do what we can to try to better it; but I ask you gentlemen to remember and to beware and realize we could kill this whole proposition by loading it down with amendments, whether they sound good or not. We can do too much in trying to have our cake and eat it too. We can easily talk this bill here to death as well as try to get something we know will not be passed by the Senate or approved by the President. We know the opposition to this bill is powerful and far-reaching. We know people say it cannot be administered because of the two-bale exemption to the little farmer. They estimate it will take too much cotton away from the sum total allotted to the country at large.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia or anybody else if I can answer their questions in the limited time I have.

Mr. TARVER. I know the gentleman's purposes are sincere, but I call his attention to the language of section 2, the first portion of which reads as follows:

If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton is less than two bales—

And so forth. It seems to me there is a very good chance for the Department of Agriculture to construe this to tie the allocation to the land, and not to provide for a minimum allocation to the producer who has no land, who is a tenant or share-cropper of as much as two bales. I know that is not the purpose of the Doxey bill, but the language could very easily be clarified by providing for the allocation to each producer unit of not less than two bales.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call attention to lines 24 and 25 in the Doxey bill which provide distinctly that it shall be a tenant or a share-cropper cultivating the land.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no; it does not say that. It says where the land is cultivated by a tenant or a share cropper the certificate shall be issued to him. How many certificates? Does it mean two bales' worth of certificates to 5 or 6 tenants or share-croppers on the land? The bill is indefinite in that particular and it ought to be clarified if the gentleman from Mississippi intends to provide for a two-bale allocation to each producer.

Mr. DOXEY. I am sure both gentlemen know that was and is the intention of the author of the bill, who is myself. Under the 5-minute rule this bill will come before you open, and it can be clarified and amended, but let us not make any amendments except those that may clarify or clear up our intentions specifically.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield, gladly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Before the gentleman gets away from section 2 let me give the gentleman this information: In the State of Georgia last year there were 28,029 producer units, that is, individual farmers, receiving less than a two-bale allotment; 1,228 receiving only 240 pounds, 6,203 receiving from 240 to 478 pounds, 9,016 receiving from 479 to 717 pounds, and 11,541 receiving between 718 and 959 pounds of cotton.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate the contribution from the gentleman from Georgia. We are all familiar with the figures and conditions of our respective States, yet we know the figures which the Department now has are not complete, and they will admit it, and this is an estimate only.

I want to tell you how this bill will work and what will happen with reference to this allotment if we pass this bill, which I hope we will.

I believe the figure which the gentleman gave for Georgia shows more than 20,000 cotton farmers in his State who will be in the two-bale class, but I am confident we can take 20,000 as an average for the 13 cotton-producing States and we will have somewhere in the neighborhood of a correct estimate of how many farmers will be affected by the bill we are considering today. Thirteen considered as the cotton States times 20,000—the average for each State, just for the purpose of illustration—is about 260,000. That is the number of two-bale farmers that will be affected throughout the cotton-producing States of this country. If each farmer produces two bales—two times 260,000 is 520,000 bales. That is less than a million bales; approximately a half million bales that go for the purpose of continuing the thing we are trying to do—that is to help the small farmer—and if it is taken from the allotment of the big farmers or the great cotton producer, I say to you it is nothing but right. But under the facts and the plan I propose, the Secretary of Agriculture can so allot it that nobody will be hurt, and all this bugaboo about the impossibility of administration and the telegrams that you are receiving and I am receiving in opposition to it, inspired from Washington and other sources and places throughout the country, appear to me to be rather far-fetched and based on a false premise, and I do not believe they are based on the facts and figures if it is worked out in a practical way.

Now, I want you to know that the general pool will be about 10,500,000 bales; unaccounted for, nearly 700,000 bales last year. I make the prophecy—and my guess is no better than anybody else's guess—that no farmer this next year will get a smaller allotment than he got last year if you pass my bill, and those farmers who did not get what they were entitled to will get the benefit of it, especially the 2-bale farmers. You know it cannot likely be extended beyond the 2 bales, because that was the pronouncement of the President and that is what they voted on. If the program would stand more, all well and good.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I am hoping the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, author of the bill, will not consume all of his time without at least discussing the other two phases of the matter covered by this bill.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman appreciates that we are pushed for time. Now, I will discuss the next section.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield on section 2?

Mr. DOXEY. I will yield, but we can take that up and work it out under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. NICHOLS. It seems to me it is timely that the gentleman from Mississippi further explain section 2.

Mr. DOXEY. I ask the gentleman not to take up all my time please. I would not make that request, except that we can take care of all these things under the 5-minute rule.

Section 3 of this bill provides for an appeal board. We had no appeal board last year. Does not everyone agree that we want better administration of the Bankhead bill than we had last year? [Applause.]

Your applause and your other expressions of approval show you agree with me. You will not get it, in my judgment, if you do not pass some legislation. When you analyze the rules and regulations that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture, you will see that we have given to the farmer various things but the share-cropper and the tenant are not classed as farmers by the Department of Agriculture as Congress intended. That appears in the hearings and I invite your attention to the hearings.

Section 3 of my bill sets up an appeal board. Any farmer who is aggrieved, whether his allotment is 2 bales or 1,500 bales, can appeal to this board. I am not so much interested in the personnel of the appeal board as I am that there shall be an appeal board to whom the farmers can go with their allotment grievances.

I know that making the allotments public will tend toward a better administration of the act and will give more general satisfaction among the farmers.

Section 4 of my bill speaks for itself, and I feel that there is no opposition to it here on the floor.

Section 5 of my bill provides a fee of 25 cents per bale to the ginner for the cotton they gin this year. They are entitled to at least this amount. There is much that could be said in regard to this section. I know there is strong opposition to paying the ginner anything and opposition to it will no doubt develop here on the floor during the consideration of this bill. Strong opposition to it developed in the committee. However, I hope and trust that we will keep this provision in my bill and be able to pay the ginner at least the amount provided for in section 5 of this bill.

I must conclude, as my time has nearly expired, but I want to say that no administration in the history of this Nation has done more for distressed agriculture than has the Roosevelt administration. We all know, speaking in terms of the cotton producer, that if it had not been for the heroic efforts of this administration and the aid given the cotton producer, he would have been forced to sell his cotton anywhere from 5 to 7 cents per pound. The Government pegging the price of cotton at 10 cents and 12 cents each year for the last 2 years, together with the cash benefits paid directly to the producer by the Government, has been the salvation of the cotton farmer and should we have raised a crop of 15 or 16 million bales of cotton, it is likely that we would not have been able to sell our cotton at all with the great carry-over that we have had and the attitude of foreign countries in not buying our cotton for reasons evident to all of us.

The agricultural program of the present administration is broad and far-reaching. The emergency with which we were faced and which still exists, demanded action. The Bankhead bill was an emergency measure and these amendments that I have proposed are designed to provide for a better and more equitable administration of the original act during this emergency at this time.

The House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am privileged and have the honor to be a Member, has worked long and hard, night and day, on this program. As individuals and as members of the committee, we have been in contact with the authorities who are to administer this act. We have tried to reach an agreement as to just how the law is to be administered this year. As Members of Congress we have nothing to do with the administration of the act. That is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government. Our part of the Government is the legislative branch, but as Members of Congress we have a right to express our interest, views, and intentions. It is our privilege to suggest and advise and if necessary pass additional legislation if it takes that to have a better and more satisfactory administration of any law. From what I know of the cotton situation from practical experience and from what I have learned of the Department's attitude in this matter, and considering some of the rules and regulations that have been recently issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, I am convinced that satisfactory results will not be obtained in the administration of the Bankhead Act this year, unless we do pass this additional legislation in this form and definitely and specifically express the intention of Congress on these controversial and, to my mind, highly important questions. It means much to our farmers and the success of this phase of the agricultural program in which we should all be vitally interested. Therefore, I am ready and anxious to pass this legislation. That is my reason and purpose in introducing this bill, pushing this measure, and doing all I can to secure its enactment into a law as speedily as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask for further additional time, because I appreciate how many Members want to speak on this subject. I say simply that in bringing in this bill we have tried to bring in the best possible legis-

lation we could in regard to the subject. I thank you all for your valuable assistance and help in passing this bill today. [Applause.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the history of the attempt to regiment the American people in the field of agriculture and in the field of industry has been one of disastrous failure. The other day on the floor of the House the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], one of the ablest Members of the House, stated that the farmers were in worse condition now than they were at the outset of the present administration by reason of the operation of the N. R. A. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WOOD], a leader in civil life in the labor field, able, and scholarly, stated that the industrial worker was worse off than he had been before by reason of the operation of the A. A. A. General Johnson, the present spokesman of the administration, says that the N. R. A. is as dead as a dodo. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, stated in New York on Saturday last that controlled production was through.

I recall the passage of this bill in the House and the forebodings and fears that were expressed on this side of the aisle as to the effect of its passage. Every one of those fears has been realized, and today controlled production of cotton has resulted in three concrete things: First, it has taxed the American people \$235,000,000 to no purpose; second, the cotton farmer of the South has lost the markets of the world; and, third, and most dreadful of all, is the fact that it has put a million people, a million human souls, in the highways and the byways of the Southland.

On February 20 in the present year the New Republic carried an article on the conditions in the South. The New Republic is a factual magazine; it does not carry any advertising, so it always prints the facts. I do not agree with its political philosophy, I do not subscribe to that at all times, but at least it is a factual magazine. This magazine had this to say with reference to the conditions in Arkansas, one of the cotton States:

The situation in Arkansas has now become an open national scandal. Many thousands of share-croppers and tenant farmers have been dispossessed by landlords seeking to take advantage of the cotton-restriction scheme. Some of these persons are put to work in the fields at long hours for wages of 50 or 75 cents a day. Others, men, women, and children, are simply turned out along the highway—to starve, for all the landlords care. Mary Connor Myers, investigator for the A. A. A., whose report of conditions in that area has thus far been suppressed by Department of Agriculture officials, is known to have compared conditions with those in Belgium during the Great War. It is not surprising that the victims of this treatment should have organized into a Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. The landlords, aided by subservient local officials, have broken up all meetings of this union, have jailed its leaders, and are seeking to terrorize its members into accepting starvation conditions.

This, of course, is a wholesale and a complete indictment of this whole scheme.

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. AMLIE. Is there any way in which Congress can secure access to reports of the kind made by Miss Myers?

Mr. CULKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have requested a copy of this report.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The committee tried to get that report. We did have the report up to the committee, but we were not able to have the facts in the report disclosed to the committee, because they said the investigation was not completed.

Mr. CULKIN. It is a matter which was in the public prints on February 20.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the humanitarian phase of the situation. This article goes on to state in the editorial vein, if you please:

When we reflect that all this is the result of the Roosevelt administration's great humanitarian policy of helping the American farmer, we have something that can be nominated for the grimmest joke of the century.

The State of Alabama contains about 2,000,000 people; it is potential in the oil field, it is potential in agriculture, and is very rich in timber. The Federal Government, I will say, Mr. Chairman, has paid in processing taxes to this State \$21,629,000, while these unfortunates, white and colored, are walking the highways and the byways with no place to hide their heads or to shelter their children.

This State paid on relief \$16,169,000, 94.8 percent of which was contributed by the Central Government; on non-Federal P. W. A., \$9,000,000; on Federal P. W. A., \$22,000,000; a total disbursement by the Federal Government in that State of \$69,733,000. Yet, by virtue of the operation of this bill, the results of which were prophesied in advance, hundreds of people are suffering and living under a condition comparable to the conditions of the Belgians after the German Army machine had passed. Nor, Mr. Chairman, does the financial drain end there; and, I repeat, I am more concerned about the human equation than I am about the money involved. The gentleman from Alabama, Senator BANKHEAD, has introduced in the other House a corollary to this bill. His bill proposes, if you please, that in the rough the Government shall spend another \$1,000,000,000 to house the victims of this policy, which has destroyed industry, which has destroyed labor, and which has brought to the dust the southern cotton farmer. This pending bill seeks to right a wrong that has occurred.

It is belated, but what I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House is that this whole policy is fatal to the Nation. It is fatal to the farmers of the Nation. It is fatal to the men in industry and is a continuing leak from the Federal Treasury, which will eventually destroy our credit and drive us into inflation.

Let me give you one of the results of this fatal policy. In my own town we had a bag factory erected at a cost of about a million dollars. Under the processing tax this factory was unable to operate and, of course, had to shut down. America took from Japan and Germany dominance in the rayon industry, which in this country employed thousands of people. Today that is lost. Brazil is at the present time putting 3,000,000 acres of land into cotton. The whole policy of regimentation, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, is fatal and is destructive of the best interests of America. It is time that this House call a halt on these theorists and "brain trusters" who have led America astray. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts a few minutes ago, taking into consideration the broad national scope of this legislation, inasmuch as it is not only of interest to the cotton sections of the United States but would help every section of this country.

If what the gentleman who has just preceded me said is true, certainly he ought to be heartily in favor of the passage of this bill, because we propose to take care of the very type of people about which he has been talking; and certainly, if we can make the cotton South prosperous, it will be reflected in every section of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said through the mails, by the press, and especially by the enemy of the cotton program, in reference to destroying our foreign markets. I want to say to you that two-thirds of it is nothing more or less than propaganda. When we poured millions into foreign countries during the war our exports were fine. After the war, when our Government came to a halt in making loans, what happened? The great banking interests of the country conceived an idea that they would take up where the Government left off. They proceeded to flood the country with millions of worthless foreign stocks and bonds. During this time our exports were good, regardless of the

price of cotton in the United States. In 1929, when the crash came and innocent banks and the innocent investing public realized what had happened to them in that the value of these stocks and bonds were worthless and the flood of American money to foreign countries came to an end again, our exports began to slow down. I want to state, if we will extend credit to a great many of these foreign countries, they would again take our cotton and other products. There are several things which must be taken into consideration in regard to regaining our foreign markets—the monetary policy, tariff, and the importation of foreign goods.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

In August 1934 the exports of cotton were 83 percent of the 10-year average—1923 to 1934—exports for that month. The greatest reduction in exports was in the shipments to the so-called "gold bloc" countries. Consumption of cotton goods, both in foreign countries and in the United States, has fallen off. Why? Because of the lack of purchasing power. Those who are opposing the A. A. A. and the Bankhead bill want normal production, stating in so doing we will regain our foreign markets, which according to their statements will save the cotton South.

During the period 1900–1901 to 1933–34, grouped into years when exports were 6,600,000 bales or less, when exports were between 6,610,000 and 8,600,000, and when exports were 8,610,000 and above, what happened?

Results

Group	Number of years	Average annual exports	Average per pound received by producer	Average annual farm value of quantity exported	Acres required to produce quantity exported annually
1.....	12	5,738,000	19.8	\$559,146,917	17,004,352
2.....	15	7,582,000	12.6	480,873,267	20,445,066
3.....	7	9,356,000	10.0	474,576,071	22,668,976

The above table illustrates clearly the effect of price on both exports and farm income from exports. For 12 of the 34 years—1900–1901 to 1933–34—the farm price of cotton averaged 19.8 cents per pound and exports averaged 5,738,000 bales per year and the farm value of the cotton exported averaged \$559,146,917. While on the other hand, for 7 of the 34 years the farm price of cotton averaged 10 cents per pound and exports averaged 9,356,000 bales per year, and the farm value of the cotton exported averaged \$474,576,071. For each of the 7 years during the period cotton producers planted and cultivated 5,664,624 more acres and harvested, ginned, and marketed 3,618,000 bales more than they did during each of 12 years of the period and received \$84,570,846 less for the cotton produced for exports each year. Who profited from these increased exports? Cotton producers did not.

Exporters, cotton merchants, and handlers of cotton secure their profits per bale, the larger the number of bales the larger their profits. What about the farmer? The larger the number of bales, the harder his work, the longer his hours of toil, and the smaller his profit, or no profit at all, and in many cases poverty and bankruptcy. Farmers have played their part. They have never ceased their farming operations to catch up with this surplus; they have not turned off their tenants, but have continued to divide with them, pay their taxes, pay their doctor bills, and bury them when they die. This is not true with the cotton-mill business, banking, or any line of industry. The banking interest, big business, and industry are putting out propaganda at this time that they are hesitating because of what the present administration is doing. They are stating: "If the Government will cut out farm control, stop trying to control or hamper business, business will go forward."

Oh, yes; prior to 1933, during a Republican reign, under farm products to feed and clothe the world but they had that the Government did not attempt any of the present policies. In fact, business, banking, and industry were sitting in the saddle, or, I should say, had complete control, of the administration in power and the Congress. What hap-

pened? When Mr. Roosevelt took charge he found that farmers had plenty of cotton, wheat, hogs, and all other farm products to feed and clothe the world but they had no market. Big business, the large banking interests, and industry, had bled the people white; they had no place to go. They "hesitated" while farmers were going into bankruptcy and unemployment and breadlines increased.

We have heard much from these groups that are hesitating about the Government plowing under cotton and killing hogs to get rid of the surplus. Yet, when they hesitate, from time to time, packers refuse to buy hogs, farm prices go down, cotton mills slow down, even close down, and in the meantime they are able to make profits by cutting down and controlling their production. In the meantime, however, by so doing, they are placing farmers and wage earners into bankruptcy, breadlines, and many of them to untimely graves.

Quoting Mr. Anderson some days ago when he appeared before the Agricultural Committee opposing farm legislation, he stated in answer to a question by me that the great flour-milling industry prior to 1933 when these mills were buying farmers' wheat at 30 cents per bushel, they made money. Although he was opposing the wheat program and the processing tax that under Mr. Roosevelt has given wheat farmers 90 cents for wheat, he acknowledged the fact that his industry made more profits in 1933–34 than they did prior to 1933 at which time farmers in the West were burning corn and going on a strike.

Why not investigate the fact that during the time the price of cotton was cheap and when the farmers were starving, certain large cotton merchants in this country exported cotton to the foreign countries and stored it there. During the past year 1934–35 you will find American cotton was consumed by the industries of foreign countries to about the same extent as in previous years. But, we did not export as much cotton for the reason that these large exporters already had the cotton over there and for the further reason they have not the purchasing power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why the necessity of this bill? It is because under the administration of the Department of Agriculture the purpose and intent of the original bill was not carried out.

If you will refer to sections 7 and 8 of the old bill and the subsections thereunder, it proposed to take into consideration the tillable land on each farm, and whether or not a farmer had voluntarily reduced, or whether or not on account of drought or flood, his production had been cut down.

SECTIONS 7 AND 8

SEC. 7. (a) The amount of cotton allotted to any county pursuant to section 5 (b) shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to farms on which cotton has been grown within such county. Such allotments to any farm shall be made upon application therefor and may be made by the Secretary based upon—

(1) A percentage of the average annual cotton production of the farm for a fair representative period; or

(2) By ascertaining the amount of cotton the farm would have produced during a fair representative period if all the cultivated land had been planted to cotton, and then reducing such amount by such percentage (which shall be applied uniformly within the county to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph) as will be sufficient to bring the total of the farm allotments within the county's allotment; or

(3) Upon such basis as the Secretary of Agriculture deems fair and just, and will apply to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph uniformly, within the county, on the basis or classification adopted. The Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the manner of allotment to individual farmers, shall provide that the farmers who have voluntarily reduced their cotton acreage shall not be penalized in favor of those farmers who have not done so.

(b) After the crop year 1934–35 the apportionment shall not be on the basis set out in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The total allotment to farms in each county under this section shall not exceed the approximate number of bales allotted to that county under section 5 (b).

SEC. 8. Whenever an allotment is made pursuant to section 3, not to exceed 10 percent of the number of bales allotted to each State shall be deducted from the number of bales allotted to such State, and allotted in such State—

(a) To producers of cotton on farms where for the preceding 3 years less than one-third of the cultivated land on such farms has been planted to cotton;

(b) To producers of cotton on farms not previously used in cotton production;

(c) To producers of cotton on farms where, for the preceding 5 years, normal cotton production has been reduced by reason of drought, storm, flood, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural cause; and

(d) To producers of cotton on farms where, for the preceding 3 years, acreage theretofore planted to cotton has been voluntarily reduced so that the amount of reduction in cotton production on such farms is greater than the amount which the Secretary finds would have been an equitable reduction applicable to such farms in carrying out a reasonable reduction program.

The allotments provided for in this section shall be in addition to the amounts apportioned to the counties under section 5 (b).

A lot of these large farmers known as "cotton hogs", who have been planting practically all of the tillable land on their farms were not cut in line with the provisions of the bill just read to you. The type of farmer we are interested in here is the farmer who was unable to buy but little fertilizer, who was unable to get sufficient supplies and may I say further that when he asked for a seed loan, he had to reduce his acreage 30 percent or he could not even get that small loan with which to carry on.

What position do we find these large farmers and these little farmers in? Let us take 2 farms with 50 acres of tillable land in each. We will assume that both farmers have the same number of acres. One of the farmers continues to make 30 bales of cotton, the thing that has brought about the surplus. The other farmer, because of poverty or voluntarily, reduces to 10 bales, or perhaps, had to cut, as stated, to get a seed loan. Those who framed the bill and worked for its passage intended that the bill would be so administered as to bring the 10-bale farmer up and cut the other farmer down so that they would both be on the same basis. But what happened? They cut both down on the same percentage basis, giving the 10-bale farmer 6 bales and the other farmer with the same size farm, same size family, 18 bales. This is responsible for the poverty in connection with both the Negroes and small white tenants and farmers who own and control the small farms or who farm as tenants.

When we had normal prices and somewhat normal prosperity that same class of farmer, with, usually, a large family, producing three, four, five, or six bales, lived in poverty and could not produce any more. He is still being penalized, and under this bill, while the larger farmers and those who are responsible for the surplus received hundreds and thousands of dollars in rental and parity price checks. These are the farmers who are able to walk around with plenty of money, whooping up the Bankhead bill, while the small farmers and those discriminated against, producing five, six, or seven bales, with large families, are being reduced to poverty and forced to seek relief from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the gentleman [Mr. DOWDY] referred to awhile ago was the Appeals Board. The Department states that they do not want any legislation; that they can handle this; in fact, I have already appointed the Appeals Board. I tried last year, even wired the Department, to appoint an appeals board for each county, but they refused. Farmers, especially those who had not received a square deal, were writing and coming to see me, many of them with tears in their eyes, but I was unable to secure relief for them. We propose under this bill to create an appeals board and not permit the Department of Agriculture to appoint the members of the appeals board, which the Department has already stated would come from the extension service, or recommended by the extension service. The bill under consideration proposes to let the Department name one member, and the other two members will be appointed on the recommendation of the Attorney General and the secretary or commissioner of agriculture in each State. I would like to see a disinterested board in each county. We would then have a board to which farmers can appeal and get justice, wipe out discrimination, and cut down or put up allotments in accordance with what they are entitled to receive under the bill.

I was at the Department recently and find that they have a number of statisticians and economists who will tell you that, to make this little increase up to two bales, it will mean

about 2,000,000 bales that will have to be taken from the larger farmers. I want to say to you that, if you will increase it up to three bales, it will not take over 1,000,000 bales. They will also tell you that if you give these little farmers 2 bales, a farmer with 10 tenants will put on his farm 20 tenants. This will not happen and if so that can be taken care of under the rules and regulations under the original Bankhead bill.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has no confidence, then, in the figures of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I do not deny the facts as presented but I disagree with their conclusions, for the simple reason that their facts are based on the wrong premises. If a farmer does not produce over 2 or 3 bales of cotton, why would he need a tenant? If he produces 10 bales, perhaps, he would not have over 1 tenant. There are not many tenants who would come under the provisions of the 2-bale exemption except in small sections of the various cotton States where, perhaps, the major crop is tobacco or some other basic crop. In this case, certainly, the major crop should be taken into consideration and not the small acreage planted in cotton. In other words, they should take into consideration the planting of these other major crops in allotting cotton to these farmers.

Mr. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman feels that the operation of the Bankhead Act last year was a failure due to the unfairness of the Department.

Mr. FULMER. As far as being fair to all cotton farmers, and especially the small cotton farmer, yes. As a whole, certainly it has improved the agricultural condition in the South wonderfully. The controlling of production and on account of the benefits received under the A. A. A. many farmers have been able to pay past due taxes, interest, and payments on their mortgage indebtedness, and are in a much better position to buy the things manufacturers have to sell. These improvements in the farming sections have helped business and employment.

The tendency on the part of those who oppose the Bankhead bill and the cotton program, including the large cotton merchants and the cotton mills that talk about the processing tax, is that they want the cotton South to go back to twelve to fifteen million bales. Why? As stated, because their profits are per bale, and therefore they would be able to make more money—purely a selfish interest.

Much has been said about foreign countries shipping in cotton, cotton goods, and other goods that compete with cotton here. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture can put on a compensatory duty on foreign imports and take care of this situation, and this has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the bill.

The bill provides for the payment to ginners 25 cents per bale for their extra expense, cost of bond, extra bookkeeping, and acting as tax collectors on overproduction by the Treasurer of the United States, provided they do not enter into an agreement or operate under a code which would enable them to take care of the extra expense. If I had my way in writing and passing this bill, I would graduate allotments so as to be fair to small one-, two-, and three-mule farmers and tenants. If this is not eventually done, this class of farmers will have to be taken care of by the Government. The movement has already been started by the Government to rehabilitate these farmers by renting lands and furnishing stock, fertilizer, and supplies. I predict that the next move on the part of the Government will be to buy lands, placing buildings thereon for these unfortunate farmers. What will happen then? Some of these large farmers, some of whom produce one, two, five, and even ten thousand bales of cotton, will be begging for tenants, or will have to sell some of their large holdings.

I was told one farmer in Texas received a rent check for \$25,000. Mr. Oscar Johnston, who is holding a very important position with the Agricultural Department here in Washington, produces 20,000 bales of cotton in Mississippi. I would like to hold his rental check in my hands for a while.

Who is responsible for our production? Who are receiving the greater benefits under the Bankhead bill? The answer is simple.

In closing may I state that we can continue to issue bonds, appropriate billions, but until agriculture gets a square deal, farmers get a fair price for their products, cheaper interest rates, and their just portion of the dollars paid by the ultimate consumer, just so long will taxes increase and prosperity remain around the corner.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, this bill has some very good features, and one feature which, I believe, is very bad.

I believe it is advisable to extend the operations of the Bankhead Act for 1 more year, particularly in view of the fact that its life depends upon the willingness of the farmers to have it extended for an additional year, because under the provisions of this bill we provide a referendum held by the farmers must show that they want the bill to be in effect or to be operative for an additional year.

I am particularly pleased with the provision written into the bill which gives a 2-bale exemption to the small producer, to the share-cropper, to the tenant, and to the other farmers who produce 2 bales or less of cotton annually. In other words, the bill makes the first 2 bales of cotton exempt from tax, and I think this will materially assist the small farmer, the share-cropper, and the tenant farmer.

The provision of the bill that sets up an appeals board is considered of vital importance, and although I have not had sufficient contact with the old appeals system to know how it has been operating, it seems that those who are interested in the operation of this measure feel that an appeals board, set up as proposed in this bill, is very essential.

The one objection I have to the bill is the language contained in section 5, providing for a fee of 25 cents per bale to be paid to the ginners.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that there are about 14,000 cotton gins in the country that have been collecting these taxes during the past year from the producers and turning them over to the Federal Treasury. These ginners estimate that the average cost to them to collect this tax and pay it over to the Federal Treasury averages about 50 cents per bale and they have come before the committee and have asked the committee to put a provision in the bill whereby they shall be compensated for the cost of collecting this ginning tax.

In my opinion it would be absolutely unjust and unfair for the Government to pay this fee to the ginner. The ginners say that they are collecting this money for the Government and that therefore the Government should compensate them for their services in collecting the tax.

It is true that the money goes into the Treasury of the United States, but it is not put into the Treasury of the United States for general fund purposes but for the purpose only of assisting cotton farmers. So in reality the expense incurred in collecting the tax is for the benefit of the farmer, and if there is anyone who should pay that cost, it should be the producer of the cotton for whom the service was rendered.

The General Treasury does not benefit from the tax collected under the Bankhead Act. During last year, only \$90,000 was collected under the provisions of the Bankhead Act.

The bill provides that 25 cents a bale shall be paid to the ginner. It is estimated that there will be more than 10,000,000 bales ginned during the next year. That would be two and a half million dollars collected by the 14,000 ginners that perform this service for the farmer. In view of the fact that the Bankhead Act collects \$90,000 a year, and I cannot see any hope of collecting any more, I do not see how the country can get two and a half million dollars out of the \$90,000 found. It is clear in my mind that part of the money heretofore appropriated for the general purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration will have to

be spent to pay this fee to the ginners. I do not believe it is fair; I do not believe it is just and right for them to come here and ask us to pay the cost of collecting the tax.

The cost of collecting that tax should be assumed by the ginner or be passed on to the producers by an increase in the price they charge for ginning cotton. They say that cannot be done. Why, in the name of common sense, can it not be done? It is part of the operating cost of doing business. My opinion is that it can be considered the same as any other item of cost—the cost of machinery, depreciation, labor, and all that goes into the cost of ginning cotton. This service should be performed by the ginner and charged up against the industry rather than coming out of the general fund.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I am inclined to think that the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. Ginners used to charge \$2 and \$2.50 a bale, and now the price has been pyramided up to \$3 and \$4 a bale.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The average charge last year was \$4.10 a bale. I am satisfied that they should include in the cost of operation, the cost of collecting the tax. The ginners coming here and asking for this hand-out, is unjustifiable, and when the proper time comes I propose, if no one else does, to offer an amendment to strike out section 5, take that provision out of the bill, and thereby prevent the Government from giving the ginners what I consider an unfair and unjustifiable fee.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Cobb from the Department, stated when before our committee that if Congress did not take action on compensating the ginners, they could or would, by rule or regulation, pay the ginners for their services.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, I do not think the gentleman will find that statement in the hearings.

Mr. ANDRESEN. He told the committee that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the committee before the hearings he stated they could provide for everything except that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Cobb did say before the committee that he was sympathetic with the idea of paying something to the ginners for collecting this tax, and he gave the impression, although without using the direct words to the committee, that if we let them go along without in any way amending the act, leaving them to go ahead and do as they saw fit, that they would provide for some kind of compensation to the ginners. If we say definitely, by our action here, that we do not want to pay this fee, I do not think they would have the nerve to go ahead and pay it, even though they thought they could under existing law.

Mr. STUBBS. I would like to point out to the Congress that by adopting this amendment we are going to emasculate the bill and do a real injury to the farmer.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not think this will emasculate the bill. It is only one phase of the operation of this entire system, and during the last year they have operated without compensating the ginners, and in view of the fact that they are performing no service for the Government I cannot see why the Government should pay them that fee. Of course they are assisting in the collection of a tax that goes into the Federal Treasury, but as the gentleman knows, the United States Treasury does not benefit by the operation of the Bankhead Act, and the act was not intended as a revenue measure.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. DOXEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Bankhead Act or the general cotton program, not only by the exemption certificates and other phases, is paying its way, and its assets exceed its liability?

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, and they should continue to pay their way, and the Bankhead Act should be forced to pay its way. We should

not pay this two and a half million dollars in the form of a hand-out to the ginner. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Mississippi permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. DOXEY. I have not any time. I wish I had. The only time I have is at the disposal of gentlemen who have been allotted time. The gentleman from Texas will have time under the 5-minute rule.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill, but I am just wondering where we are going. I shall vote to cut out section 5 as I do not believe the ginner is entitled to this extra fee. I am wondering if we are not overloading the whole Triple A Act. Within a few days we are going to be asked to vote on making potatoes a basic commodity. Then if any grower of even an acre of potatoes expects to sell a few pounds, he must have an allotment. Hops must come under the sheltering wing of the Government. It will not be long before we will have the question as to whether or not we are going to impose a processing tax on beef and lamb for the benefit of the corn-hog program. I am wondering if we are not overloading the whole act. Are the consumers going to be able to pay the cost of the commodities after the various middlemen have added all their extra charges? It is beginning to look very serious to me.

Oregon has benefited very much from the Triple A Act, especially in regard to wheat and somewhat in regard to hogs. I have no doubt that the South has been benefited on cotton. Can the cotton and wheat producers meet the competition that must be met in the world's markets? The export market for our wheat is already gone. Only 18,000,000 bushels of wheat were exported last year. You gentlemen from the South are in the same position on cotton. You are fast losing your export market. The Pacific Northwest must find an outside market for thirty or forty million bushels of wheat grown in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho every year. Where is it going? Formerly it went to Europe. Right now some of it is being sold in the Mississippi Valley by reason of a subsidy from the triple A funds. I know full well that this cannot continue indefinitely. Are we approaching this problem from the right direction? I am going along with the cotton Representatives because I am so anxious to see something done. I realize all that you say about the small cotton producers of the South as well as the much harassed farmers of all other regions. Are we moving in the right direction? There are 10,000,000 still unemployed and 20,000,000 on the relief rolls, half fed, not half clothed.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has expressed a doubt as to the benefit of the present program. Would it not be better for us to abandon that program and seek an export outlet for our surpluses which we produce in this country rather than continue under the present program of the A. A. A.?

Mr. PIERCE. I am just thinking. I have no decided opinion, but I am beginning to be somewhat worried about the triple A being topheavy, and the whole thing toppling down on our heads. My program would be to reduce interest rates first. Interest on money should never be over 2 percent annually. Interest rates on farm mortgages should never be over 1½ percent annually. Then railroad freight rates should be cut one-half. Every person able to work should have a job even if only that of raising his own food. Tax-exempt bonds should be at once abolished. If all had a chance to consume I do not believe there would be much surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I did not know until it was disclosed on the floor a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that we were going to

defer consideration of section 1 of this bill which provides for extending the Bankhead Cotton Act to 1937. Otherwise I would have had no particular desire to speak on it at all.

I am going to vote for the amendments exempting small farmers from the operation of the act, and, with proper amendments, I shall also vote for the other provisions, since none of them extend the life of the original act. I think there is no opposition to the bill with section 1 eliminated. At least, I am sure there is no opposition on the Republican side, and I have not heard of any even on the Democratic side.

Mr. STUBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STUBBS. I wish to say there is opposition. I represent a great cotton-producing area, where legitimate farming is carried on.

Mr. MOTT. Very well. I will qualify my statement on that point and will say merely that there is no opposition on the Republican side. We all favor these amendments, just as we all opposed and still oppose the original Bankhead Act. I am going to vote for these amendments because I think they will take at least a little of the injustice and the inequity out of the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill, in my opinion, was one of the very worst pieces of legislation that has ever been passed by the Congress of the United States. Not only has it caused more hardships and suffering to thousands of our people than any other agricultural bill that has ever been passed, but it also went further along the road to complete congressional abdication than almost any other law. And as long as the Congress of the United States continues to abdicate its jurisdiction, and as long as it continues to refuse to legislate on important legislative subjects and turns the jurisdiction of those subjects over to the executive department of the Government, as it did when it passed the Bankhead Act, we will have the same trouble that we are now having under the administration of this act.

You cannot allow the executive department to make the law and expect to get justice for anybody. We had the same experience under the economy act, and we had to repeal it in order to get justice for the veteran. We are having the same experience under the Foreign Trade Agreement Act, and we will have to repeal that before we can get justice. At the present time, under the Bankhead Act, we have learned again that whenever you give the executive department the right to make law the people will suffer.

I opposed the Bankhead Act for several reasons. One was because it provided for compulsory reduction of an agricultural crop, which is wrong in principle, and which, as far as I know, never has worked, either in this or any other nation. I opposed it because I knew if this act were to become even partially successful, probably by this time we would have compulsory crop-reduction laws for every agricultural product in every State in the United States.

As a matter of fact Mr. Tugwell, before the close of the last session, had already introduced in the Senate a bill providing for the same kind of dictatorial, compulsory power over the production of wheat and corn and every other product that the Bankhead bill now provides over cotton; and I say to you now, had it not been for the doubt which existed in the minds of the majority at the last session that the Bankhead bill would work, I believe that broader compulsory crop-reduction laws would have been passed by Congress before the adjournment of the Seventy-third Congress.

Now, although the Bankhead Act has been of very great admitted detriment to a large number of small farmers in the South, and although we are sorry to see the suffering that has been caused by the utter failure of this act to work, yet from another point of view I think the failure of the Bankhead Cotton Act—and the introduction of these amendments is the best proof of its failure—I say that the failure of this bill to work is in some respects very fortunate indeed. It ought to teach us, if it teaches us nothing else, from this time on to take jurisdiction of important legislation in our own hands, to recapture it, if you please, instead of continuously and forever passing the buck on every kind of

legislation to some officer, some theoretical, inexperienced, incompetent person in the executive department, and permitting him by blanket authority to make law for us.

That is what the Bankhead bill did. In that bill you gave the Secretary of Agriculture power to make cotton-production law. That is what the Economy Act did. In that bill you gave the President power to make veteran law. That is what the Foreign Trade Agreement Act, the Tariff Act of 1934, did. In that bill you gave the President power to make tariff law. All those things are wrong. When you surrender legislative jurisdiction to an officer in the executive department you will always find yourselves in trouble, and you will always find that sooner or later you will have to repeal the law by which you surrendered that jurisdiction.

I have already attended two or three hearings on proposed trade agreements with foreign nations, agreements which involve a reduction by Executive order in the protective tariffs which we now have on many of our commodities.

Without exception, on every one of those hearings, every delegate in Congress from every State of the Union which grew or manufactured the products involved in the proposed trade agreement, was in attendance before the committee for reciprocity information. They were there, Democrats and Republicans alike, begging that committee not to injure or not to reduce any of those tariffs. They were begging the President, in other words, not to exercise the discretionary authority which they gave him when they voted for that law. That is the situation that we get into whenever we surrender any part of our legislative jurisdiction to anyone in the executive department. I have always voted, and always will vote, against every law of that kind.

I hope, when we consider section 1 of this bill, that we will recapture the jurisdiction surrendered through the enactment of the bill and that we will proceed to repeal the Bankhead Law altogether.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What does the gentleman say about the success of the wheat program?

Mr. MOTT. The success of the wheat program is doubtful. I get many letters every day from farmers in my district. I should say the great majority of them are utterly dissatisfied with the working of the A. A. A. And I may say also that that has begun to be the case with the N. R. A. We did not go so far in surrendering legislative jurisdiction under these laws as we did under the Economy Act, the tariff act, the Taylor grazing bill, and the Bankhead Act, but to a certain extent we did lay down on the job of evolving and enacting legislation on these subjects, and we turned that responsibility to somebody in the executive department who had never had any experience either in legislation or in the field of business involved in those particular subjects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did not the gentleman support the legislation for the wheat grower?

Mr. MOTT. I voted for the A. A. A. as an emergency provision for voluntary crop control and for the reason that most other members of my party voted for it. We needed, in that emergency, some regulation, and the only bill that the Congress was allowed to consider on this subject was the A. A. A. We offered you a better solution, but at the behest of the administration you ignored it, and it was a question of taking that or nothing. It came up in such a way that it could not be amended. You saw to that through your gag rule.

But, understand, I am not putting the A. A. A. in the same class as the Bankhead bill, because the Bankhead bill goes much further. The A. A. A. is voluntary. The Bankhead bill is compulsory. It turns the entire control of cotton in the United States over to the discretion and the whim of one man. It makes the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute dictator over the fortunes and destinies of every cotton farmer in the United States.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the wheat allotment is not satisfactory to the wheat growers of Oregon? The gentleman does not want to go on record that way, does he?

Mr. MOTT. I said the farmers in my own district. I understand quite well that the farmers in the district my colleague represents are on a little different footing than the ones in western Oregon, because they are wheat growers exclusively and they would benefit to a greater extent than those engaged in the diversified farming of western Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it not true that the wheat grower who has received an allotment is highly satisfied with it?

Mr. MOTT. No; I would not say so at all. The general sentiment among the farmers of my district seems to be that as long as the Government is handing out this money for destroying crops they might as well take it, but they are not satisfied by any means.

I will state to my colleague what legislation the farmers of my district want. My State is one of 25 States in the Union whose legislatures by formal action have memorialized Congress to pass the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage refinancing bill. That is what they want in the way of refinancing aid; and they also want us to pass the Swank-Thomas cost-of-production bill to give them cost of production plus a reasonable profit on that part of their crops which is sold and used in the United States. [Applause.] If the Congress will pass these two bills and in addition will pass legislation to take care of our exportable surplus along the lines proposed in the old debenture bill, our agriculture will proceed immediately along the road to recovery; but if we continue to pass legislation of this kind, the kind exemplified in the Bankhead Act, we shall never get out of the depression and shall never see that long-promised and long-hoped-for brighter day. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, when the Bankhead bill was passed, many of us were led to believe that it would not affect the small farmers. I recall that my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Busby, offered an amendment to exempt the small farmer from the tax, but it was defeated on account of the assurance that in the operation of the law the small one-horse farmer would be taken care of. Much to my surprise, in my district which consists largely of small cotton producers, farmers who in the first instance had raised a bale of cotton, were reduced to 250 pounds. The fact that a man had a wife and four or five children did not make any very deep impression upon those who were enforcing the law from the Washington headquarters. As a consequence, hundreds of small farmers in my congressional district found themselves with an allotment insufficient to pay even the cost of production; and I am very glad indeed that Congress by this act is going to exempt the small producers. We should exempt at least four bales.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. No; I have too short a time. Within the first few days of this session I introduced a domestic-allotment plan. It has been my thought that there are two things the farmer is entitled to. The first is a parity price for his product. As long as we have tariff laws in this country to protect certain industries it is our duty to make these tariff laws function for the agricultural producer of exportable surpluses. The second thing to which the farmer is entitled is the foreign market. The Bankhead bill, and the way it is being administered, in my judgment, will close the foreign markets to the American producer of cotton [applause], because we are storing in Government warehouses thousands of bales of cotton upon which we have loaned 12 cents a pound; and, of course, we cannot sell 12-cent cotton on the markets of the world when the purchasers can buy cotton for much less. So it seems to me we might as well recognize this situation as it is. The farmers of this country will be satisfied if you give them on their domestic consumption, or rather, on the portion of their crop domestically consumed, a tariff benefit that will make the tariff laws func-

tion for them the same as they function for other protected industries. Then let the farmers raise as much cotton as they want to and let the laws of supply and demand control the surplus cotton. [Applause.] It seems to me that by such a measure we would give the farmer an opportunity to earn a profit, an opportunity to hold for us the markets of the world instead of permitting consumption of foreign production to increase. The percentage of cotton consumed on the markets of the world is steadily coming from sources other than our own country.

Mr. Chairman, it stands to reason that if we continue this policy of curtailment, not only will we destroy the small cotton farmer, the farmer who raises from 2 to 10 bales of cotton, but we increase distress. It is not the little farmer who is responsible for the so-called "overproduction"; it is the great plantation owner, the corporate farm. It is the large producer who is responsible for overproduction, yet you are penalizing the little farmer by strictly applying this law to him and reducing him to a ridiculous allotment, even as low as 250 or 300 pounds of cotton, not enough to support one of his children. When you do that you drive him on relief. I received letters from farmers stating that if we do not permit them to make a living by raising cotton, then they will have to go to relief headquarters and apply for help. On the other hand, those producers of cotton who had not produced the amount that was allotted to them received their certificates and sold those certificates to little farmers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is merely an act of common justice. Either we exempt these people and give them the opportunity to secure a little cash to try to pay their taxes and buy the things for which they have to pay in cash, or they go on relief; and it seems to me the next step is to enact a domestic-allotment plan. I have been an advocate of the domestic-allotment plan for a long time. In fact, my original farm-silver bill which passed the House would have been far more helpful than the Bankhead bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the passage of the Bankhead Act I said I wanted to go along with the Members who represented other sections of the country than mine in an effort to try to do something to relieve the whole farm situation. I am still of that opinion. With section 1 out of the bill by agreement, there is nothing controversial except section 5, and as to that there may be a difference of view and a division of the vote. We should all join hands to help each other and to restore agriculture to safety and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me, I wish to call attention to a thing that will do the farmers of the country much more good than anything that is proposed in this bill or in any bill regarding allotments or production control. I have reference to the lowering of interest upon farm mortgages.

That is a thing that will relieve the farmers generally throughout the whole country. Reduce interest on farm mortgages and you will do more good than by reducing crop production. This Congress should address itself at once to the subject of stopping farm foreclosures and of reducing interest rates.

This particular bill was introduced in the Congress on March 5. Long before the bill was even introduced, and on the 18th of February, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the chairman of this great committee stood here on the floor and said that he would bring before us Senate 1384, the Farm Credit Act, which had attached to it the Wheeler amendment. That is one month ago today, and still this House has had no chance or opportunity to pass upon that bill or even consider it at all.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does the gentleman know of any reason why that bill has not been brought up?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I have not asked the chairman of the committee. I supposed he was acting in good faith when

he stood here on that day and made the following statement, as shown by page 2112 of the RECORD:

We had hoped to get it up tomorrow, and in any event we expect to take it up just as soon as we can possibly get the right of way.

The chairman no doubt is doing what he believes to be his full duty to the committee and to the Congress, but may I say that several times I have tried to get this relief measure, which I think it is agreed will help the whole country, before this Congress. We have waited one full month since it was given a preferential standing in this House, and yet we stand here today without action and with no apparent probability that we will ever have action.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have been patient long enough. It seems to me that those who are in control of the machinery of this House ought to give us a chance to vote upon this bill. The committee has voted it out. Read the RECORD. It was given a preferential standing one month ago today. Since then we have been in recess on Saturdays and on many other days. Oftentimes we have had nothing to do. We have had to listen to general debate on idle subjects not infrequently during this month. But the Wheeler amendment has not been brought to our attention. Our hands are tied.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I would like to ask the chairman, who is on the floor, when we will hear from that bill?

Mr. McFARLANE. Did the committee favorably report the bill containing the Wheeler amendment?

Mr. GILCHRIST. The Wheeler amendment was given a preferential standing on February 18. Yes, the committee made a favorable report.

Mr. McFARLANE. Let us draw up a petition and put it on the desk and have it brought up.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GILCHRIST. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. JONES. Well, it is not going to be taken out of my time.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I want to call attention to the fact that on page 2111 of the RECORD the gentleman from Texas asked unanimous consent that Senate bill 1384, which is the bill containing the Wheeler amendment, may be given a preferential standing and such consent was given. The bill containing the Wheeler amendment should properly have come up and should have been debated long ago. I want to go along with agriculture. I would like to join the gentlemen from the South who think cotton should be helped, and I have tried to do so. I also want to go along with all agricultural people, and I have tried to do that. But let us join together now in an effort to get something that will be beneficial to the farm people throughout the whole country. Let us get this Wheeler amendment before the Congress, or the Frazier-Lemke bill, or some measure that will really protect the homes of our farmers from foreclosures and sheriffs' sales.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in common with all of my colleagues I would like to improve the condition of the average cotton farmer, share-cropper, and tenant.

Under the Cotton Control Act, or the Bankhead Act, as it was passed last year, there was a limitation on the production of cotton to 10,000,000 bales, which limitation was a wise one. This was distributed among the States based upon the average production of the preceding 5 years. The State production was in turn distributed among the various counties. There were discriminations and inequalities, but, in my opinion, the Cotton Control Act has been greatly beneficial to the growers, large and small, in the cotton area of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration proposes to enlarge the provisions of the act that we passed last year in one important particular, and that is by exempting two bales of cotton to every grower. I believe the President of the United States was right when he said, on December 5 in a press release, that there should be exempt to every farmer two bales of cotton. I am going to read the President's statement, which is as follows:

If the Bankhead Act is continued in effect for another year, it is my purpose to recommend to the Congress an amendment granting exemption for the full amount of his base production to each farmer who has an established base production of not more than two bales of cotton.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration is carrying out that recommendation. The regulations announced for 1935 provide for that exemption. I believe that is just as far as we can safely go. In our desire to help the share-cropper and the tenant we must not injure the small landowners of the country, the man that produces 4, 5, or 6 bales of cotton. While a good deal has been said about the large landowner and the large plantation, I remind you that such plantations are made up of share-croppers and other tenants. The average farmer rather than the large landowner uses tractors. Tenants are more numerous on the plantations. I have heard about mechanical cotton pickers but I never saw one successfully operated. Cotton is a hand crop, and it takes people to raise cotton. But whenever you enlarge the exemption, you take it away, in most cases, from the average farmer, the man who owns his farm. That is the man the President of the United States wanted to help and the man he is helping. I take it he is satisfied with the regulations that have been promulgated by the Agricultural Administration to carry out his promise and recommendation. It would be unwise to go beyond the President's promise—there is danger of wrecking the program.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield if the gentleman will yield me more time.

Mr. DOXEY. As the gentleman knows I cannot yield him any more time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment, I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman, because I understand his desire to improve general cotton conditions.

What will be the effect of adopting the pending bill to extend the exemption not only to the farmer who raises two bales of cotton, but to the share-cropper and the share tenant? I am not asking you to take my figures. The chairman of the committee has not given us any figures furnished him by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I am going to refer to the hearings as to what would obtain in Chatham County, N. C. If you make the exemption to all producers, including the tenant and the share cropper, it would require more cotton than the entire amount of cotton allotted to that county.

I have before me a statement furnished by the Director of the Cotton Division with respect to Walker County, Ala., if this bill is adopted so as to extend the exemption to the share-cropper and the share tenant. Mr. Cobb states that in that county this means that the producers who produced 38 percent of the cotton in the period of 1928 to 1933, received 38 percent of the 1934 allotment, while in 1935 this group of small producers would receive 89 percent of the entire production in the county. Surely the small landowner, the owner-farmer would be discriminated against.

What about the small farmer who owns his own farm and has not paid his Federal land-bank loan? You are not going to be able to take any bales from the large landowners except as you take them away from his share-cropper and his share tenant and from the small landowners.

I favor the exemption of 2 bales to the farm owner advocated by the President and by Mr. Cobb, who states, as shown by page 105 of the hearings, that the exemption of 2 bales to the farm can be administered without disrupting the county quotas. There would be an increase in allotments. In North Carolina it would take 6,115 bales to provide for an exemption of 2 bales to the farm. It would take 8,299 bales to provide for such exemption in Mississippi, as

shown by statement from page 105 of the hearings, which I intend to include in my remarks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein a statement by Director C. A. Cobb as to the effect of a 2-bale exemption in North Carolina, as shown by page 103 of the hearings; a statement by Director Cobb as to the effect of a 2-bale exemption in Chatham County, N. C., as shown by page 104 of the hearings; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb, giving the estimated allotment necessary to allot each producer in Franklin County, Ark., 2 bales; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb respecting the estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to Walker County, Ala.; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb giving the number of growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less and between 2 and 3 bales in 1934 in Mississippi, Arkansas, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, showing a necessary increase in allotment in these States only of 753,958 bales, and a statement by Mr. Cobb, as shown by page 105 of the hearings, showing that the 2-bale exemption advocated by President Roosevelt and now being put into effect by the Cotton Division will not disrupt the county quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I include the following from page 103 of the hearings:

THE EFFECT IN NORTH CAROLINA OF ISSUING A MINIMUM ALLOTMENT OF 2 BALES OF TAX-EXEMPT COTTON TO EACH PRODUCER LOCATED ON A FARM WITH AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE BASE PRODUCTION OF 3 BALES OR LESS

There are slightly more than 87,000 producers in North Carolina who would qualify for a minimum allotment of 2 bales. One hundred and seventy-four thousand eight hundred and six bales of 478 pounds net weight would be required to make a minimum allotment of 2 bales to each such producer in North Carolina. This is 31.5 percent of the estimated allotment for North Carolina in 1935.

These growers produced 18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina during the base period. We would thus find growers who had in the past produced approximately 18 percent of the cotton in the State receiving in 1935 slightly more than 31 percent of the State's allotment. The allotment to such producers would have to come out of the allotment due to growers normally producing about 82 percent of the State's crop of cotton.

The producers on farms with an adjusted average production of 3 bales or less received an allotment of 95,961 bales in 1934, or 18.2 percent of the total allotment to North Carolina in 1934. These growers produced 18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina during the base period. It is thus seen that in 1934 the allotment to such producers was approximately the same percentage of the total allotment to the State as their production was to the total production in North Carolina during the base period.

While 87,000 producers in North Carolina would get an average increase of 82 percent in their allotment in 1935 over that received in 1934, the remaining 102,000 producers would receive a 12-percent smaller allotment in 1935 than they received in 1934, and this in spite of the fact that the allotment to North Carolina in 1935 will be 26,400 bales larger than the allotment received in 1934.

TABLE 1.—North Carolina—A comparison of 1934 allotments, etc.

Production range	Number growers or producer units	Estimated average bales produced per unit	Average total bales produced during base period (column 2 × column 4)	Estimated allotment, (1934) (column 4 × 62205)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0-239	5,488	0.45	2,470	1,635
240-478	15,708	.80	12,566	8,319
479-717	17,981	1.25	22,476	14,880
718-956	17,447	1.75	30,532	20,214
957-1,195	15,480	2.25	34,830	23,059
1,196-1,434	15,299	2.75	42,072	27,854
Total	87,403		144,946	95,961

87,403×2 bales=174,806 bales or 31.5 percent of estimated allotment in 1935.

North Carolina 1934 allotment, 528,688 bales.

North Carolina 1935 allotment, 555,122 bales (estimated).

The 1934 allotment to producer units with adjusted average production of 3 bales or less was 95,961 bales or 18.2 percent of the total allotment to North Carolina in 1934.

174,806 bales—95,961=78,845 bales increase in 1935 over 1934 to these growers.

144,946+78,842 bales=18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina.

I include the following from page 104 of the hearings:

THE EFFECT IN CHATHAM COUNTY, N. C., OF ISSUING A MINIMUM ALLOTMENT OF 2 BALES OF TAX-EXEMPT COTTON TO EACH PRODUCER UNIT WITH AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE BASE PRODUCTION OF 3 BALES OR LESS

There are about 1,999 growers in Chatham County, N. C., who would qualify for a minimum allotment of 2 bales. To give each of these producers a minimum allotment of 2 bales would require 3,998 bales, or 123.9 percent of the estimated 1935 allotment to Chatham County. These growers produced 66 percent of the average adjusted production in Chatham County during the base period and in 1934 they received 66 percent of the total allotment made to Chatham County under the Bankhead Act.

To make a minimum allotment of 2 bales to each grower who would qualify would require 1,969 bales more than the same growers received in 1934. This would exceed the estimated allotment to the county for 1935 by 770 bales, or 23.9 percent. This would mean that other producers in the county would receive no allotment of tax-free cotton and an additional 770 bales would have to be taken from producers in other counties.

The growers in Chatham County who received allotments of less than two bales each in 1934 in the majority of cases are located on farms with other sources of cash-farm income. In 1929 the value of all farm products in Chatham County was \$2,083,052. The value of farm products on cotton farms that year was \$656,001, or 31.5 percent of the total for the county.

Of the 2,240 farms reporting cotton in 1929, only 1,152 were classed as cotton farms. This means that in 1929 only 1,152 of these farms received as much as 40 percent of their income from cotton. In 1929 there were over one-half as many pounds of tobacco produced in the county as there were pounds of cotton. Wheat was relatively important in 1929. In that year 1,572 farms reported 10,626 acres of wheat.

To make a minimum allotment of 2 bales of tax-exempt cotton to each producer located on farms with an adjusted average base production of 3 bales or less in Chatham County, it would be necessary to take such cotton out of allotments due cotton producers located in strictly cotton-producing areas where cotton is practically the only source of cash farm income.

TABLE 2.—Chatham County, N. C.—A comparison of 1934 allotments, etc.

Production range	Number growers of producer units	Estimate average bales produced per unit	Average total bale produced during base period (col. 2 × col. 3)	Estimate allotment, 1934 (col. 4 × 77139)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0-239.....	235	0.45	106	81
240-478.....	577	.80	462	352
479-717.....	512	1.25	640	487
718-956.....	302	1.75	528	402
957-1195.....	193	2.25	434	330
1196-1434.....	180	2.75	495	377
Total.....	1,999		2,665	2,029

1,999 × 2 bales = 3,998 bales or 123.9 percent of estimate allotment in 1935.

Chatham County, N. C., 1934 allotment 3,074 bales.

Chatham County, N. C., 1935 allotment 3,228 bales (estimated).

The 1934 allotment to producer units with adjusted average production of 3 bales or less was 2,029 bales or 66 percent of the total allotment to Chatham County, N. C., in 1934.

3,998 bales—2,029 bales=1,969 bales increase in 1935 over 1934 to these growers.
(2,665 ÷ 4,038) bales=66 percent of adjusted average production of Chatham County.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Franklin County, Ark.—Estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to each producer-unit having an average production of 2 bales or less, and to allot not less than 2 bales to each producer-unit having an average production of more than 2 bales

Production range (pounds produced per producing unit)	Number of producer units	Average bales produced per unit	Total bales produced during base period by ranges	1934 allotment in bales by ranges
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
From 0 to 239.....	113	0.45	51	30
From 240 to 478.....	624	.80	499	291
From 479 to 717.....	631	1.25	789	460
From 718 to 956.....	210	1.75	368	215
From 957 to 1,195.....	259	2.25	583	340
From 1,196 to 1,434.....	129	2.75	355	207
Total.....	1,966		2,645	1,543

The average production of cotton in Franklin County, Ark., by 2,240 producers in the period 1928 to 1933 was 4,602 bales. Of this amount 1,966 producers, each having an average production of 3 bales or less, produced 2,645 bales. The total county allotment

in 1934 was 2,772 bales, of which 1,543 bales were allotted to these small producers of 3 bales or less, while in 1935 they would receive 3,932 bales if 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of 2 bales or less and not less than 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of more than 2 bales. Relatively, this means that producers who produced 57.5 percent of the cotton in the period 1928 to 1933 received 57.5 percent of the total county allotment in 1934, while in 1935 this same group of small producers would require 41.8 percent more than the total county allotment.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Walker County, Ala.—Estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to each producer unit having an average production of 2 bales or less, and to allot not less than 2 bales to each producer unit having an average production of more than 2 bales

Production range (pounds produced per producer-unit)	Number of producer units	Average bales produced per unit	Total bales produced during base period by ranges	1934 allotment in bales by ranges
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
From 0 to 239.....	132	0.45	59	31
From 240 to 478.....	518	.80	414	215
From 479 to 717.....	500	1.25	625	324
From 718 to 956.....	516	1.75	903	468
From 957 to 1,195.....	397	2.25	893	464
From 1,196 to 1,434.....	493	2.75	1,356	703
Total.....	2,556		4,250	2,205

The average production of cotton in Walker County, Ala., by 4,546 producers in the period 1928 to 1933, was 11,042 bales. Of this amount, 2,556 producers, each having an average production of three bales or less, produced 4,250 bales. The total county allotment in 1934 was 5,727 bales, of which 2,205 bales were allotted to these small producers of 3 bales or less, while in 1935 they would receive 5,112 bales if 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of 2 bales or less and not less than 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of more than 2 bales. Relatively, this means that producers who produced 38.5 percent of the cotton in the period 1928 to 1933, received 38.5 percent of the total county allotment in 1934 while in 1935 this same group of small producers would receive 89.3 percent of the total county allotment.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Number of cotton growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less, and between 2 and 3 bales during 1928 to 1933, in 1934 for selected States with an estimate for the entire Cotton Belt

(From 1934 Bankhead applications—on basis of 478-pound bales)

State	2 bales or less	Between 2 and 3 bales	3 bales or less (column 2+column 3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Alabama.....	61,895	49,515	111,410
Arkansas.....	33,833	32,897	66,730
New Mexico.....	280	314	594
North Carolina.....	56,624	30,779	87,403
Oklahoma.....	30,907	32,940	63,847
Tennessee.....	22,936	19,733	42,669
Total.....	206,475	166,178	372,653
Estimate for entire Cotton Belt ¹	518,781	417,532	936,314
Estimated average production ²	518,781	1,043,830	1,562,611
1935 allotment assuming 35 percent reduction.....	337,208	678,460	1,015,668
Plus 103,000 bales allowed for making allotments as regulations now read in determining the national allotment of 10,500,000,000.....			1,118,668
Estimated requirements for making allotments by proposed plan ³	1,037,562	835,064	1,872,626
Necessary increase in allotment.....			753,958

¹ Assuming that the same relationship for small producers as compared to the number of applications exists in the remainder of the Cotton Belt.

² Assuming 1 bale as average for the group included in 2 bales or less.

³ Granting 2 bales to each producer unit falling in the 2 groups.

The two groups above do not include the 1934 Bankhead applications covering farms on which cotton was grown in 1934 for the first time since 1927, a large percentage of which fall in the two groups. There were approximately 75,000 such applications on which it is estimated there were about 60,000 producer units growing less than 3 bales and would increase the 753,958 bales to 850,000 bales.

It is estimated that the producer units omitted from applications in 1934 and the increase in 1935 of the number of producer units would easily increase the draw upon the national allotment to from 1,500,000 bales to 2,500,000 bales.

I include the following from page 105 of the hearings:

THE GENERAL EFFECTS OF ALLOTTING TO FARMS HAVING AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION OF NOT MORE THAN 3 BALES THEIR ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION UP TO 2 BALES (956 POUNDS) AND ALLOTTING 2 BALES TO EACH FARM HAVING AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION RANGING BETWEEN 2 BALES AND 3 BALES

An analysis of the States of North Carolina, Mississippi, and Oklahoma indicates that 130,000 to 150,000 additional bales would be required (a) to allot to farms having an adjusted average production of 2 bales or less their full adjusted average production, and (b) allowing 2 bales to each farm having an adjusted average production ranging between 2 and 3 bales. This would mean that such farms would get an increased allotment of approximately 25 percent over that received in 1934. It would further mean that the increased allotment to such farms would take up approximately 30 percent of the increased national quota for 1935.

A minimum allotment of their adjusted production to farms averaging 2 bales or less during the base period and allotting 2 bales to the farms with an adjusted average production of between 2 and 3 bales can be effectively administered in 1935, and would occasion no material delay in making allotments as prescribed in the act.

Such a plan can be administered without disrupting county quotas.

This plan can be put in effect without serious injury to the established cotton producers.

A comparison of 1934 allotments on farms having an adjusted average production of not more than 3 bales with the estimated 1935 allotments permitting each such farm its adjusted average production up to 2 bales (956 pounds) and allotting 2 bales to each farm having an adjusted average production ranging between 2 and 3 bales

State	Number farms producing—		Allotments				
	2 bales or less	Between 2 and 3 bales	Adjusted averages of farms producing 2 bales or less	Number farms (column 2) times 2 bales	Estimated total allotment 1935 (columns 3 and 4)	Allotment in 1934	Additional cotton to provide minimum allotment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
North Carolina.....	Farms 23,687	Farms 14,488	Bales 28,480	Bales 28,976	Bales 57,456	Bales 51,341	Bales 6,115
Mississippi.....	18,514	16,075	24,262	32,150	56,412	48,113	8,299
Oklahoma.....	14,901	15,426	20,396	30,852	51,248	36,662	14,586

I anticipated that it would be argued that the exemption to the small farmer, tenant, or share-cropper would be taken from the large planter. I, therefore, furnished information, not based upon my opinion, or my guess, but I have given the facts as furnished me by Mr. C. A. Cobb, the Director of the Cotton Division.

As I pointed out, if an exemption is made to each producer rather than to each farm, 87,000 producers in North Carolina would receive an increase of 82 percent in their allotment, while the remaining 102,000 producers would receive a 12-percent reduction.

Again, as shown by the statistics furnished by Mr. Cobb, there are 1,999 growers in Chatham County, N. C., who would qualify for the allotment of two bales. This would require 1,969 more bales than the same growers received in 1934. This would exceed the estimated allotment to the county by 770 bales. The result would be that other producers in the county would receive no allotment and an additional 770 bales would have to be taken from producers in other counties.

Walker County, Ala., is not a county of large cotton planters. The figures furnished by Mr. Cobb show that the producers who produced 38.5 percent of the cotton from 1928 to 1933 received 38.5 percent of the total county allotment for 1934, while under the exemption to the farmer, share-cropper, and tenant the same group in 1935 would receive 89.3 percent of the total county allotment. The farmer who has denied and sacrificed, who is anxious to pay the loan on his farm, where he produces five or six bales of cotton, will be discriminated against. Farmers will want to know why their allotments were reduced from the 1934 allotment when the total cotton crop was increased 500,000 bales over the 1934 crop.

The case of Franklin County, Ark., covers a county of average farmers. Those who produced 57.5 percent of the cotton in the period of 1928 to 1933 received 57.5 percent of the allotment for 1934; while in 1935 the same group would require 41.8 percent more than the total county allotment. Some other county in Arkansas will receive less than its share.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] stated that the Department of Agriculture had furnished him with no figures as to how many bales would be required to provide for the 2-bale exemption to each farm owner and each share cropper and share tenant. I wanted to know the facts. Mr. JONES stated that his information was it would take something like 500,000 bales. Mr. Cobb estimates that in Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee it will take 753,958 bales. Mr. Cobb states that it would take from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 bales to provide for the 2-bale exemption to the farm owner, share-cropper, and tenant. He opposes it. He states it would really wreck the program.

I have pointed out that the President had in mind an exemption of two bales to the farm owner. We should know the effect of such an exemption. Such an exemption would require 8,299 bales in Mississippi. It would not disrupt the county quotas.

In extending my remarks I am advised that with section 1 of the bill eliminated the 2-bale exemption to each farm owner, appeal boards, and adjustments on account of drought, flood, or diversified farming can be made by regulation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. All of the provisions of the bill except that which applies to compensation to ginners can be provided by regulation. I am in sympathy with the provisions for compensation to ginners, but I think all ginners should pay a fair price for cottonseed. The ginners have been called upon to do much additional work, not for the benefit of the producers, but to enable the Government to collect the tax. Ginners are required to give bond; they are required to keep numerous additional records and to file lengthy reports with the Collector of Internal Revenue. They are entitled to compensation. This compensation would be paid out of the same fund that is used in paying the other expenses of the administration of the Cotton Control Act. It is a source of satisfaction that the Cotton Control Act is more than self-liquidating. The processing taxes are ample to provide the costs of administering the Cotton Control Act. The ginners should be paid out of the general funds.

Section 2 of the bill provides for an exemption of two bales to the farm owner, to the tenant, and to the share-cropper. I have stated that the President advocated the exemption to the farm owner. I have also stated that the crop in 1934 was fixed at 10,000,000 bales. As provided by law, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has fixed the crop for 1935 at 10,500,000 bales. They have issued regulations exempting two bales to the farm owner. Unless the production is materially increased it would be most hazardous to increase the exemption.

Again, section 2 increases the weight of the bales from 478 pounds to 500 pounds. The increase in the weight of the bales would require a larger crop. Large crops mean small prices. It means increased carry-over.

Section 3 of the act provides for appeal boards. Its purpose is to eliminate inequalities and to correct injustices. It provides for boards of three members, one to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the second to be appointed by the attorney general of the State, and a third by the Commissioner of Agriculture. I believe that this provision is unwise. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the administration of the act. If mistakes were made in the allotments they were made by the county committees. The Secretary has profited by last year's administration.

The committees for the year 1935 are elected by the farmers, share-croppers, and tenants. The Secretary of Agriculture is arranging for adjustment boards. He realized that mistakes were made last year. I believe that he should have the right to appoint the members of the boards.

After all, the boards should be governed by fixed rules and regulations. It will be the province of the boards to see that all growers are accorded the same rights and that the same yardstick obtains in all allotments.

It has been said there was politics in the local boards. If the appointees of the attorney general of the State and of the State commissioner of agriculture are substituted for the appointments by the Secretary of Agriculture, there will be more politics. Moreover, the rules and regulations may be entirely different from the other rules and regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe, therefore, that section 3 of the act should be amended so as to provide that the adjustment boards shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that these boards shall be governed by rules and regulations made by him.

Personally I believe that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration did a good job in the plow-up campaign of 1933 and the reduction program of 1934. Mistakes were made, but all allotments were based upon acreage and production. If the grower was not allotted an adequate production, it was because his 5-year average did not warrant it. The Cotton Control Act provided that there should be uniformity of reduction. If there had been diversification, it was because diversification was profitable. The farmer who had diversified was given 65 percent of his production; the farmer who raised five or six bales of cotton was given the same percentage; the large owner with many tenants and share-croppers was given the same percentage. The yardstick was certain and definite. The acreage and the production controlled.

Exemptions to the home owner in the city and in the country are made in many jurisdictions. The Government encourages the farm owner. The President had this point in mind when he advocated the 2-bale exemption to the farm owner. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration interpreted the President's language to mean an exemption of two bales to the farm owner. The Administration has not waited on Congress. The President's recommendation has already been embodied in regulations that have been prepared for the 1935 crop. I have asked Mr. Cobb to furnish me with an amendment that will embody the exemption of two bales. I shall offer it as a substitute for section 2 of the pending bill. At the same time I have asked Mr. Cobb to furnish me with a copy of the regulation for adjustment boards for 1935. It is my purpose to offer an amendment to provide that the adjustment boards be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and that the program announced by the Secretary in this regard be embodied in the pending bill.

Adjustment or appeal boards are imperative. In 1934 there were mistakes. Greater consideration should have been given to the flood and drought areas and to the farmers who diversified. Congress provided the necessary machinery. The Secretary evidently thought that his rules and regulations were sufficient. He set aside 10 percent of the entire production for the contingencies mentioned. It would have been sufficient to have given the small farmer a 2-bale exemption and to have given the farmer who suffered from drought or flood or who had diversified a relatively larger production. Such was the intent of Congress. While the Agricultural Adjustment Administration made a good job of the control program in 1934, it knows the problems and is prepared to profit by its mistakes. I believe that inequalities will be removed by the boards.

All Members of Congress are interested in the welfare of the share-cropper and the tenant. He has fared better under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration than he has for years. In 1932 he was receiving \$30 a bale for his 3 bales of cotton. In 1935 he received \$60 a bale for his 3 bales of cotton. He could afford to pay the tax and still have his income increased. All growers, both large and small, are entitled to equal treatment. All had been growing too much cotton; the carry-over had reduced the price; it had made slaves of all growers. Instead of arraying the large grower against the small grower, I am asking for cooperation. Let all do their part.

I believe in home ownership. The 2-bale exemption will encourage it. It is justified, but share-croppers and renters obtain on large plantations in greater number than on small plantations. They will be entitled to their exemptions.

INEQUITABLE AND INSURMOUNTABLE

If the cotton-control or Bankhead Act has not been beneficial it should be repealed. The administration should not be hamstrung in its enforcement.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has made its program for 1935. It has fixed the production, it has provided for the 2-bale exemption, it has provided for adjustment committees, elections have been held for county committees. It is the most democratic of all regulations. Every share-cropper, tenant, and landowner had the right to vote for members of the county committees. If mistakes were made it was the mistake of the growers and producers.

I am in favor of limiting the exemption of 2 bales to landowners because additional exemptions would greatly increase the exemptions provided in the program. The 500-pound bales would increase the amount of exemptions. The total amount of the exemptions would come out of the national allotment. Some States would have their allotments reduced; some counties would have their allotments reduced; some growers would have their allotments reduced; there would be innumerable complaints. The average farm owner will want to know why his production was cut down in 1935 when there was an increased crop of 500,000 bales provided.

The landlord shares in the exemptions. If the allotment is less than 2 bales the bill provides that the difference between the allotment and the 2 bales shall be covered by bale tags to the tenants. The landlord will be denied his share. No class of our citizens has been having more trouble than our landowners; they pay the taxes; they pay the mortgages. They will be discriminated against under the pending bill.

I am advised by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration that it would be difficult if not impossible to make fairly and equitable the estimate providing for the exemptions. The 1934 figures included farms; they did not include new share tenants or new share-croppers. It would take some time to secure the necessary data. Data for the 2-bale exemption to the owner has been secured. If the Secretary of Agriculture overestimated the amount which would be tax exempt if the bill is adopted, the national allotment would be to that extent decreased below the 10,500,000 bales. If the Secretary of Agriculture should underestimate, the national allotment will be increased beyond the 10,500,000 bales.

In many counties all of the cotton allotted in 1934 would be consumed; other counties will hardly give up their allotments without protest for the benefit of 2-bale exemptions to tenants, share-croppers in other jurisdictions.

The administrative difficulties, I am advised, are practically insurmountable. It is desirable that the tax-exempt certificates be in the hands of the grower by the harvesting season of 1935. If the bill is passed, there will have to be a change in all of the forms that have been prepared; it might be harvest time before the certificates are ready. This would mean a delay that would cause great confusion.

In the opinion of Mr. Cobb, as I have heretofore pointed out, it will be necessary to raise the national allotment of 10,500,000 bales to a figure higher than the national allotment by an amount estimated at from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 bales. The interest of the cotton growers would be hindered and not helped by the pending bill.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has leaned over backward to aid the tenant and the share-cropper. I prefer to follow the recommendation of the President rather than to endanger the entire control act by unreasonably increasing the production.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tarver].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in construing the statement of the President, issued on December 5 of last year, has made the same mistake made by the director of the cotton section, Mr. Cobb, when he was testifying before the Committee on

Agriculture, in that he does not consider anybody a farmer unless he owns a farm, thereby making farmers out of all the mortgage companies, banks, insurance companies, lawyers, doctors, and city folks throughout the country owning farming lands, and preventing from being considered as farmers the more than a majority of the farming population who cultivate the lands but do not own them.

Now, this is a view that may be appropriate to the Delta country of the Mississippi where, I understand, the gentleman owns several large plantations. It may be that in that section of the United States only a man is considered a farmer who is fortunate enough to be vested with the ownership of land; but I am interested, and I think the Membership of this House should be interested if it intends to bring about any measure of relief by the passage of this bill, in the majority of the farming population of the South who are tenants or share croppers, and some of whom beyond dispute, have been ground into the dust in the administration of the Bankhead Act.

I only have 5 minutes and no one can undertake to discuss this proposition in 5 minutes, but I want to tell you that you are in danger of being deceived into believing you are passing something for the benefit of this class of farmers, when you are not doing it, or at least I am afraid that the provisions of section 2 of this bill, providing for this small exemption, will be so construed by the Department of Agriculture as to nullify the benefits that you intend to bring about. Read it, and read it carefully, and see if you find in that section any provision which assures the cotton producer, if he be a tenant, or share cropper and not owner of land, 2 bales of tax-exempt cotton. It is not there unless the Department of Agriculture in construing it shall read it into the bill, and my observation of constructions made by the Department of Agriculture has been that these constructions so far have been against the interests of the little farmer. I can only hope, if the language of this section is not changed, that the Department will construe the language to assure the minimum exemption to each producer, and not merely to each farm.

One word with regard to this appeals provision. This bill proposes to set up a board of appeals. God knows one is very necessary. Some method of correcting the mistakes made by county committees ought to be provided, but the machinery set up in this bill will not give any relief. You cannot find three men in any State who can take the time to investigate and decide upon their merits all of the thousands of appeals that will come before them for decision.

Last year, while they say we did not have any appeals board, they told us we had one and told us to submit our appeals to that board, and for my own congressional district I assisted in presenting approximately 1,000 of these appeals. None of them received any consideration except the appellant received a consoling letter; but in my State, if every congressional district had as many appeals as there were from mine, there would have been 10,000 cases for the consideration of this board of three men, and if you do not provide anything except one State board of three men to consider these appeals, requiring farmers who may desire to appeal to travel, in some instances, hundreds of miles in order to testify personally before that board, or to carry their witnesses that far in order to have the proper facts presented for their consideration, then you have not provided machinery here by which any man who is complaining of an adverse decision of the county committee can secure any remedial action.

I intend to propose an amendment at the proper time providing for arbitration in the county of the residence of the appellant, allowing the appellant to name an arbitrator, the authorities of the Department of Agriculture to name one, and these two to name the third.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a newspaper clipping now being published in the papers of the South stating that this 2-bale exemption has already been made by the Department, when in fact we all know the Department does not intend to make any exemption to

the tenant farmer, and its officials have frequently so stated, and some excerpts from a letter sent to me by the chairman of my State allotment board, Mr. G. V. Cunningham.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to are as follows:

[From the Walker County Messenger, Mar. 15, 1935]

WALLACE EXEMPTS 2-BALE FARMERS FROM COTTON ACT

Farmers who produce 2 bales or less of cotton were exempted last week by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace from provisions of the Bankhead production control act. This was done under regulations governing operations of the act instead of through legislation, as had been expected.

The exemption was granted in answer to protests from Southern Senators and Representatives who declared that operation of the act last year penalized small producers.

Cully A. Cobb, director of the cotton division, was unable to say whether the 2-bale exemption total would be taken out of State quotas before they are distributed among counties. "County allotments will be made as before without reference to the 2-bale exemption", he said.

Under provisions of the Bankhead Act a tax of 50 percent of the market value of cotton is levied on all production above 10,983,264 bales of 478 pounds net weight.

STATE OF GEORGIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORKS,
Athens, Ga., March 7, 1935.

Hon. M. C. TARVER,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TARVER: Thank you very much for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained your speech with reference to the Bankhead Act and the letter I wrote you on December 15. You are right. I hope you will stay with it.

I, of course, am not a lawyer and have had no legislative experience. But when it comes to the application of the Bankhead Act as of 1934, I am sure, doubly sure, that corrections along the lines I have suggested are necessary, and those of us who can should plead and fight for the small farmer for a few crumbs of additional cotton to come from the tables of the more fortunate—those whose financial status has allowed them to maintain a good base even though they have practically gone broke before the Government came to their rescue.

As to how the 2-bale allotment minimum to producer-units would affect Georgia, I submit the following figures:

The records here show that there were 28,029 producer-units receiving less than 2-bale allotments. There were: 1,228 that received 240 pounds or less; 6,203 that received between 240 and 478 pounds, or less than a bale; 9,016 that received between 479 and 717 pounds; 11,541 that received between 718 and 956 pounds; 41 miscellaneous producer-units that received from less than 240 pounds up to 956 pounds.

The total number of bales received by these producer-units amounted to 36,811 bales. Had each producer-unit received a minimum of 2 bales they would have received 56,058 bales, or an increase of 19,247 bales. I estimate that about 5 percent of the producer-units were not indicated on forms BA 8 and 9, so that there were approximately 30,000 producer-units that received less than 2 bales.

The records here show something over 209,000 producer-units. If my estimate is correct of there being approximately 5 percent not recorded on forms BA 8 and 9, then there are approximately 220,000 producer-units in Georgia. Subtracting the 30,000 producer-units receiving less than 2 bales from the 220,000 would leave approximately 190,000 producer-units that received more than 2 bales.

Now, Georgia's allotment was 875,000 bales. The 30,000 producer-units receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit received 36,811 bales, according to our records, to which should be added about 5 percent because of those left off of forms BA 8 and 9, which gives about 38,000 bales. So that those receiving above 2 bales per producer-unit received 837,000 bales. This means that this group received an average of 4.4 bales per producer-unit, as compared with those receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit.

Now if those receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit were given a minimum allotment of 2 bales, it would increase the number of bales going to this group about 20,000 bales, as can be determined from the figures submitted. If these 20,000 bales were taken from the group receiving above 2 bales, it would still leave to this group an average of 4.3 bales per producer-unit.

Taking the figures I have submitted as to what might be expected for the belt as a whole, it would mean that approximately 360,000 producer-units in the belt received less than 2 bales per producer-unit, though I am inclined to believe that the records would show that this number would be a bit less, since the producer-units in the West are much larger than in this area. (Since Georgia's allotment is approximately one-twelfth of the total allotment for the belt).

You will note that I have made provision that the 2-bale minimum allotment shall not apply to producer-units where the acreage grown to cotton exceeds one-third the acreage grown to all crops, and where the acreage grown to cotton is less than 3 acres. You can naturally see the reason for this is to prevent

small town-lot farmers getting the advantage of a 2-bale allotment to which they are not entitled.

Now I want to discuss the other amendments with reference to this matter. In doing so, I should like to refer to my general letter regarding this written you on December 14, 1934, a copy of which I am attaching hereto, so that you may have the principles that I had in mind.

One of the recommendations made in there is, as you will note, that 50-percent consideration be given to the man and 50-percent consideration be given to the land. With this end in view, you will note the suggested amendment to section 6 to be inserted between the first and second sentences. This is further provided for in the amendment to subsection 7 (a). You will note here that the 50-percent consideration of the man and 50-percent consideration of the land is modified so that injustice shall not be done to a farm which receives a decrease because of the application of the amendment which would bring the farm below a base cotton acreage of one-third of the cultivated area, and also that a farm will not receive an acreage base or production in excess of one-third of the cultivated area.

You will note that I have suggested "(5)" under subsection 7 (a) which contains a plan of appeal that can be an appeal board in reality, an appeal board within their own county composed of farmers whom they know and should know them and are in better position to judge what is right and just in consideration of their allotments. The provision of an appeal to the State allotment board or State board of review cannot amount to more than listening and, in fact, telling them nothing can be done. There is not time enough for a single board to handle such cases, for there will be thousands of such cases where appeals will be made.

On the question of tax-exemption certificates not to be sold in excess of those needed to gin cotton produced tax free, you will note the amendment I have suggested; and to carry out the provisions of this amendment, I have suggested the subsection providing for the tax-exemption certificates to be handled in the county office with the ginners being required to deal with the matter of tax-exemption certificates through that office and furnish proof that any cotton ginned is the property of the farmer for whom ginned and produced by the farmer submitting the cotton to be ginned. And you will note that provision is made for those farmers who have suffered because of drought and other causes that they shall receive their tax-exemption certificates to be sold.

That section 23 is amended in such a way as to so define "producer-unit" and the term "producer" that there will be no mistake as to the meaning of what is intended.

The bill as a whole, of course, will need to be reviewed and worded in such a way as not to have conflicting wording with reference to the amendments I have suggested. With your interest and the interest of others, I feel sure that a workable, livable, and heart consideration, as well as a price-objective program will be developed.

Likewise, I feel the voluntary program should be amended along the lines suggested, since it becomes a basis and guide for Bankhead allotments, and injustices in bases are as prevalent.

With best wishes, and kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

G. V. CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman State Allotment Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kansas 9 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in the spring of 1933 we passed the A. A. A. bill. It was a measure designed to reduce and control production of agricultural products. It was a measure designed to put the farmer under the control of a bureaucrat and make him a slave, and that has been the result of the operation. The Bankhead cotton bill was brought up here a year ago and that was a measure designed first to control and enslave the farmer, and it has worked that way. It has benefited the cotton farmer in just this way: It has reduced his production by upward of a third, and it has practically cut his export in half. While the whole world was producing just about the same amount of cotton this year that it did last year, the United States is producing only 43 percent of the total production, whereas the previous year it produced 60 percent, and we have destroyed our export markets.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not now. I shall later, if I have the time. Our exports are dropping away. On top of that, this pegged market here in this country has so attracted the attention of foreign bankers and traders that they have come in here and broken our cotton market. Do not deceive yourself on

that. That is what happened. On top of that, they have come in here and broken our market for butter, and they are coming in here and they are going to bust our market on other agricultural products. That will be the result of the position in which we put ourselves. A few years ago Great Britain and Holland put themselves in the position of pegging the price of rubber, and our bankers and brokers broke that peg, and the coffee peg was broken in the same way. Why cannot we learn a lesson from those things and stop this whole A. A. A. performance? Instead of just knocking out some of the worst spots of the thing, why not repeal the whole thing? It is destroying American agriculture. A lot of progress has been made on the Democratic side in the last year. At the present time I understand that the President of the United States favors the passage of this bill exempting the farmer producing a couple of bales. I call the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago a bill was passed to exempt the small producer of hogs up to 1,500 to 2,000 pounds, and that bill was killed in the Senate at the request of the President and we were not able to do anything to help out our farmers, who have been ruined, many of them in my country, by this processing tax. I do not like to see people put on the relief rolls as a result of fake relief measures. I should like to see this whole A. A. A. wiped out, instead of thinking about extending it, and I understand there is an agreement that the extension part of the bill shall go out. We should go a little further than this bill does. We should wipe out the whole business. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this processing tax affects perhaps more than anybody else the cotton farmer of the South and the textile manufacturer of the South and the textile manufacturer of the North. In my own district, in the mills that the South has not taken from us, they are in a struggling condition, which means a resultant loss of work for employees. And work is needed so desperately at this time. I earnestly hope something can be done to eliminate this processing tax. One of the prime factors in the production costs of the textile industry is the processing tax. The tax represented in 1934 about 40 percent of the wage bill of the industry and about 40 percent of its raw-material cost. Strange as this may seem, the cost of the processing tax in the case of some of the cheaper goods and yarns is actually greater than the labor cost. Call it a processing tax if you will, but it is in effect a sales tax on all consumers of cotton goods, levied at the factory and paid by the consumer at the counter, and this is where you of the midwestern country come in. Your consumers and your farmers are paying so much of the cost. In levying the tax in this manner it has worked out that the consumer is obliged to pay more than the Government received.

The effect of this tax, coming as it did at about the same time as an increase in the hourly wage in the industry, has had a dislocating effect. These cost increases, together with a 100-percent increase in the price of raw material, resulted in a decided decrease in 1934 in the consumption of domestic raw cotton.

Basing my figures on Bureau of Labor statistics for 1910-14, inclusive, the average price of 38½-inch, 64 by 60, 5.35 print cloths was 5.17 cents per yard. Last December this same fabric sold for 6.75 cents per yard, which included the processing tax. This represented an increase of 30.6 percent. The fabric which I have used as an example is that which is produced in largest volume by the industry and is therefore a fair index of the effect of the tax. In making this comparison it is applicable to state that in the same periods the increase in prices on all commodities was only 12.3 percent. Removing the tax, the December 1934 price for the fabric I have used as an index would still be 14.23 percent above the average price of the 1910-14 period. So, with the removal of the tax, cotton textile prices would be about in line with other commodity prices.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Gladly, although my time is limited.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Has the importation of cotton goods interfered with the mills in the gentlewoman's section?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is true. Of course, the Japanese importation of textiles, especially, has interfered a great deal, but that is only part of the reason we are having such a struggle. I am sorry. I wish I could yield further.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Can the lady estimate the number of men taken out of employment due to these importations?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I can put that in my remarks later. I do not want to take up the time now.

Although the cotton-processing tax alone cannot be held responsible for the high prices of cotton textiles and the decrease in cotton consumption, still the disparity in textile prices is approximately the amount of the processing tax and even if the rate of the tax is only sufficient to bring about parity as to raw cotton prices, the tax must be regarded as largely responsible for this disparity.

This cotton-processing tax is obviously a sales tax on necessities of life. As such it falls with the greatest burden on the poorer people. In its operation the cost of the actual amount of the tax per yard was far heavier in the cost of heavy goods purchased by the workingman than in the finer semiluxury goods.

You know how many of the poor people must wear cotton clothing, must buy cotton sheeting, and cotton pillows and towels. It is working a tremendous hardship upon them.

Based on today's market figures, the cost of the tax is about one-third of the market price for the commodity. This seems to me to be more than a reasonable share of the expense in raising funds for benefit payments. Certainly it has shown its effect in the reduction of raw cotton consumption.

It seems as if the poorer man must always pay the price.

There has been a great deal of difficulty in collecting this tax. While most of the industry pays the levy with reasonable promptness, there are cases, I am told, where these delinquencies amount to more than the value of the plants. This has a tendency to throw prices out of line and make for unfair competition. It has resulted in the fly-by-night type of manufacturer who leases a plant, fills his orders, and then, when the tax is about to be collected, closes his factory and looks for another opportunity to beat the law. This has had a demoralizing effect on the textile market.

Numerous complaints have been heard that the Government is not policing, or in any event adequately policing, the payment of these taxes. Thus a further premium and obstacle is placed upon the manufacturer who operates honestly and fairly.

I wish to present figures which show the collections of the tax since its inception to the end of 1934:

Collections of tax with respect to cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act

Month	Processing tax	Compensating tax	Floor tax other than retail	Floor tax retail	Total
1933					
August.....		\$104,838.31	\$2,433,865.97	\$83,000.62	\$2,621,704.90
September.....	\$869,892.39	106,808.76	9,358,507.91	1,606,799.33	11,942,008.39
October.....	5,714,906.38	111,800.15	8,839,431.12	3,273,751.53	17,939,889.18
November.....	5,343,749.04	72,250.02	9,505,287.58	2,405,896.00	17,327,182.64
December.....	14,540,038.92	66,263.07	12,310,032.38	2,529,500.98	29,445,835.35
1934					
January.....	11,995,000.26	84,474.05	2,047,225.96	1,252,280.29	15,378,980.56
February.....	8,115,412.21	97,085.17	815,232.88	202,742.27	9,230,472.53
March.....	9,081,033.80	107,734.75	296,813.28	68,443.02	9,554,024.85
April.....	8,725,936.71	102,482.72	306,281.60	64,593.85	9,199,294.88
May.....	11,570,518.63	104,287.05	265,900.78	55,193.68	11,995,900.14
June.....	9,756,871.18	128,749.04	196,460.94	49,857.70	10,131,939.22
July.....	9,965,169.98	127,656.06	166,659.66	22,004.90	10,281,490.60
August.....	7,853,342.02	68,153.30	108,343.69	15,608.59	8,045,447.60
September.....	7,285,187.69	108,836.58	101,359.81	7,495,384.08	7,495,384.08
October.....	7,833,612.57	116,417.52	69,178.10	8,019,208.19	8,019,208.19
November.....	6,294,871.39	115,885.47	65,407.64	6,476,164.50	6,476,164.50
December.....	8,233,066.49	114,648.93	45,531.29	8,393,246.71	8,393,246.71
	133,178,609.67	1,738,371.31	46,931,520.59	11,629,672.76	193,478,174.33

From office of finance officer of Agricultural Adjustment Administration

Have actually paid through Dec. 31, 1934, to the farmers in benefit payments out of processing taxes.....	\$202,500,000
Total receipts.....	204,800,000
Total expenditures, including administrative and refunds.....	218,000,000
Straight benefit payments to farmers:	
1933.....	112,600,000
1934.....	115,000,000
1935 (estimate).....	125,000,000

I cannot speak too strongly of the evils which I feel the processing tax has brought on, or hope too much that the processing tax will be eliminated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time and place I am going to offer a small amendment to this bill. It is simply this: That last year, when the bill was passed, I was in favor of it, because I believed then and I believe now that the principle involved in this and in the A. A. A. is the only possible way to get our feet on solid ground and get rid of the surpluses that existed at that time.

I believe that has been well proven.

At that time the States of Missouri and California asked for and received a provision in the Bankhead bill providing—as you will find in section 5 of the bill—that any State which had produced 250,000 bales could not be allotted less than 200,000 bales. Frankly I overlooked the fact that Illinois had not been classed properly as a cotton-producing State, and therefore had not its records in shape to receive its allotment. Where the fault of that lies I am not sure. Here are the facts in the case:

Beginning back in 1925 when the first record of the State of Illinois was kept, and back of that for some time, Illinois, and principally the two southern counties of Illinois, raised between 6,000 and 7,000 bales of cotton per year. The small flood of 1926 cut that down to 3,700 bales. The great flood of 1927 cut it within 1,000 bales. It was difficult to get back, because that had the same effect as the flood the year before, and we got 940 bales the next year. The droughts of 1930 and 1931 reduced that to almost nothing, so that we only had 619 bales allotted to that little section of Illinois which had previously raised 6,000 or 7,000 bales a year. I went to the Department and they showed clearly that under the letter of the law it could not be remedied except by an amendment to this bill. Therefore, I am offering an amendment to follow out the same proportion, that is, 80 percent of the allotment, to the State of Illinois. I am asking that any State that produced as much as 5,000 bales shall not be allotted less than 4,000. Last year we came back to something near our original amount and we raised around 4,500 bales. This is not at all unfair. It is exactly what California and Missouri really got for a very large amount. But if we take 6,000 bales, which we originally raised, and take 65 percent, which all the cotton States agreed to, we would still have approximately the amount I am asking for. I hope there will be no opposition to this amendment. I want it to be remembered that I helped on the Bankhead bill, because I thought it ought to have been done, and I think it has worked well.

I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] in that I am so proud of having voted for the Bankhead bill. I do not agree that it has been a decided success. Many of us have been disappointed and chagrined at the manner in which it has been administered. I supported the original bill reluctantly, because of the fact that we had a great surplus of cotton, and because it was conceded that America was faced with 4- or 5-cent cotton. Members of this House were assured over and over again that the

small cotton farmer would not be discriminated against. Something had to be done and that very quickly. Congress passed the Bankhead bill as an experimental plan to save the cotton farmers of the South from 4-cent cotton. Some of us offered and suggested amendments. I offered a suggestion at that time that farmers producing only 4 or 5 bales should be exempt from the tax. I believed that was right then, and I still believe so. I propose to offer an amendment at the proper time to exempt the first 4 bales from this processing tax. Of course, the reply of the sponsors of this bill will be that the Department of Agriculture says, "You will wreck the bill if you exempt 4 bales." But last year when we tried to get 2 bales exempted from the tax, our same distinguished leaders, high-pressured the Bankhead bill through this House. To declare that any amendment "will wreck the entire bill" is not a new slogan for the distinguished committee chairman who is schooled in the art of putting legislation through this House. Mr. Chairman, wreck or no wreck, this bill ought to be liberalized by exempting at least the first 4 bales from this processing tax.

Furthermore, I have prepared another amendment to section 3 proposing to graduate the processing tax under the Bankhead Act. It is absurd to say that the small cotton farmer, be he tenant farmer or small landowner, should pay the same rate of tax as the big plantation owner.

The most pitiable thing in connection with the operation of the Bankhead law, the thing that will make anyone heart-sick, is to go into the homes of many of the small cotton farmers, where children are hungry with scarcely enough clothing to cover their bodies. We must take the small cotton farmers of the South from the relief rolls and give them a chance to earn a decent living. My amendment to exempt 4 bales from the processing tax will take thousands of these farmers off the relief rolls and give them at least a fighting chance. I want to congratulate the gentleman for offering this bill. It is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS].

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, in my district I have neither the share-cropper nor the plantation owner, but I have a county that grows more cotton per acre than any county in the United States; and I come to speak for those cotton farmers who are home owners and who have an investment by virtue of the fact they must irrigate; and it is very expensive to produce their cotton. While I am in greatest sympathy with the share-cropper, I should like to state that when you pass this Doxey bill, these amendments to the Bankhead Act, you are increasing the burdens of every legitimate cotton raiser not only in my California but in every cotton-growing State of this Union. I myself should like to see this bill voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second and third sentences of section 2 and the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes" approved April 21, 1934, as amended, are amended by inserting after the phrase "the crop year 1935-36", wherever such phrase appears, the phrase "or the crop year 1936-37."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the bill to be read by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill not being an appropriation bill, and no agreement having been made to the contrary, the bill will be read by sections.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any questionnaire or other method of ascertaining the sentiment of the producers with respect to the crop year 1936-37 shall be submitted in such manner as to permit clear expression as to whether such producers would prefer the compulsory tax features of this act or whether they would prefer a domestic allotment plan with premiums paid on that portion of the cotton crop consumed in the United States."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Beginning on page 1, in line 3, strike out all of line 3 on page 1 down to and including line 4 on page 2.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to say very much about this amendment. In order that the bill might be considered under unanimous consent, the understanding was that the extension of the Bankhead Act would not be taken up at this time and that the bill which would be for the relief of the small tenant farmer would be allowed to be enacted into law without being handicapped by any major controversy. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the understanding of the House that the bonus bill would be taken up tomorrow and occupy practically the entire week, and in view of the necessity for early action if the pending bill is to be made effective at all, we felt it better to agree to this amendment rather than have the whole thing go over until such time as we might be able to take it up, which time might be too late. We agreed that the amendment might be adopted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out lines 4 to 13, inclusive?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The matter of submitting the questionnaire?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not strike that out. That might as well go out. There would be no object in holding a referendum if the act is not to be extended.

Mr. MILLER. Personally, I see no object in retaining it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I will tell the gentleman why it should be retained; we ought to have a fair election on this question, which we did not get last time when they asked the farmer whether or not he would have this or nothing and that if he voted against it he would not get anything.

Mr. MILLER. We will be voting on nothing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman that this is my amendment; that if he wants to strike out something else, I, of course, have no control over that. I simply want this one matter taken care of.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and also to the attention of the gentleman from Texas, that this referendum applies only to the crop year 1936-37, so the gentleman from Arkansas is perfectly right.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman understands that for a referendum no law is necessary. There was a referendum before any Bankhead bill was written. We simply provide here that if they have any sounding of sentiment, or any determination in reference to the crop year 1936-37 as to the basis for any future legislation, they shall submit to the

farmers a choice instead of submitting simply the one proposition.

Mr. BOILEAU. What could they do by submitting a choice embodying compulsory tax features?

Mr. JONES. That is what they submitted before when there was no Bankhead Act. It simply gives them a choice in any such sounding of sentiment; and there could not be any possible objection to giving the farmer a choice if there is to be any sounding of sentiment.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have no objection to leaving it in if it will serve any good purpose. My opinion is that it will not serve any good purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a vote on my amendment.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he does that?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. I want to be perfectly fair and frank. I hate to see a controversy arise about section 1 when the purpose of agreeing to the amendment was to avoid any controversy about this section. I believe the gentleman will remember that all of us thought when we made the agreement that section 1 as a section would go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was the first understanding.

Mr. SNELL. That was the understanding I had of this agreement that section 1 would go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to the second part of section 1.

Mr. JONES. That is the way it was reported to me; I understood that all of the first section should go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, in order properly to identify the section after the stricken matter is taken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On page 1, strike out, beginning in line 3 down to line 5 on page 2, and insert:

"That section 3 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved April 21, 1934, is"; and on page 2, line 12, after "prefer", insert a comma and the following: "in connection with a cotton adjustment program."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there were many who felt that when a referendum is taken with reference to future legislation, there should be a clear submission of a choice on the part of the farmers between two definite courses of procedure. This amendment was inserted for the purpose of assuring that that course would be taken. This was inserted when it was thought that there would be a vote on the extension which would practically give it the effect of law when the President issued the proclamation.

The question of extension for 1 year by law has been eliminated. That brings us back to the point where we will be at the end of this year when there is no legislation. This is the situation in which we found ourselves when they took the first referendum. In that referendum the sole question of whether they wanted the compulsory features of a tax act enacted was submitted. Then, when the question last fall was again submitted the sole and single question that was submitted was whether they wished that act.

Mr. Chairman, a great many people have complained to me that the farmers or a great many of them were led to think at that time that it meant the retirement of the entire program; in other words, that they had to vote for or against any program. Now, even with the extension privilege going out they may conduct such a referendum that they conducted just before the enactment of the first act. How anyone can object to the farmer having clearly and specifically placed before him the question of whether he wants a compulsory tax feature act or whether he favors

the voluntary domestic allotment program under the Adjustment Act, I cannot understand.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Would not the gentleman also want the farmers to have a choice as to whether they want anything or not; in other words, having a three-way choice?

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman will find that there is 1 person in 12 in the South that wants no program. No one in the South wants to go back to the conditions that existed before we had any program. It is unnecessary to have a vote on that question.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman that that may be true as of 1935, 1936, or 1937, but in the next year or two there may be a change of sentiment.

Mr. JONES. Technically, the gentleman may be right, but there would be so many choices that it might cause confusion. Everyone in the South practically agrees that the conditions demand some sort of a program. Here is a deliberate choice that is allowed between the two main programs which are before the public. Why not give them the opportunity of a liberal choice between the two? That seems to me to be fair, and I do not see why anybody should object to that.

Mr. DIES. If we do not have some provision in this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture may conduct an election without submitting the question of the domestic allotment to them?

Mr. JONES. Yes; he may, like he did in the first instance, and I do not offer that in criticism.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. At the present time there are two programs, the voluntary and the compulsory program, in operation. Suppose that the farmer wishes to have both programs continued, is there any way under this provision that he can say that he desires to have both programs in effect?

Mr. JONES. He probably would have both if he had the compulsory-tax feature.

Mr. HOPE. This is to force him to choose between the two?

Mr. JONES. The Bankhead bill clearly shows by its language that it is merely a supplementary program. That is also shown in the committee report. The difficulty was that the impression was created in many sections that it was a choice between this program and no program. Nobody wants that kind of a situation.

Mr. HOPE. Suppose the vote should be favorable to the compulsory program as compared with the voluntary program; then would it be the gentleman's idea that the Department would adopt a voluntary program?

Mr. JONES. No; they would have both programs.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understood under the agreement yesterday that section 1 of the bill was to be stricken entirely. If the amendment that has just been offered is adopted and the question is submitted to the farmers to vote for or against the tax on overproduction, the enemies to the whole program, including the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and all of those who are interested in overproduction will spend time and money to vote farmers against the tax on overproduction so as to bring back overproduction. These people are interested in large production; are interested because their profits are per bale. You gentlemen who are interested in getting away from the processing tax or cutting down the processing tax, if you vote for this amendment will bring about a larger processing tax. It will bring about a lowering of the world-basis price to such basis that the processing tax will have to be increased to take care of overproduction, which as stated, will lower the world-basis price in line with prices prior to 1933.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will stand by the agreement and strike section 1 entirely. It was understood yesterday that we would cut out that whole section. The cotton people

of the South generally, and specifically the cotton farmers of the South, do not want that type of provision in there, so I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] stated the other day at the time the gentleman from Texas called up this bill, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand when this bill is taken up the committee will not object to the elimination of section 1 from the bill?

Mr. JONES. That is the general understanding.

This quotation appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, March 15, 1935.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the 4.2 cents processing tax today is costing the consumer a large amount of money. It is expensive to the consumer. But if you bring the world-based price down to 5, 6, or 8 cents, and then try to maintain a parity price, you will have to increase the processing tax.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

It was my understanding that paragraph 1 was all that was involved. I had no thought of taking out paragraph 2 and that is the way I understood the agreement. There were several of us working on it. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if that is not his understanding?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When we first talked about it, it was about striking out the entire section and afterward the gentleman came to me and wanted to know if I would insist on the whole section going out, stating he would prefer to have the second paragraph continued. I said I had no objection to that at all because my thought was that the question of extension was a big subject and was one that should come up on the floor on its own merits.

Mr. JONES. That was my understanding all along, that there was some question about striking out the entire section, but the report came to me that it was the first paragraph that was involved and after I talked to the gentleman, I understood it in that way, but if I answered in the RECORD as my friend from Georgia states I did, although I understood the gentleman was referring to paragraph 1, in view of the fact the RECORD states "section", if I made such an agreement I shall stand by the agreement regardless.

Mr. DIES. What about other amendments?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can offer an amendment. I want to assure the gentleman I thought paragraph 1 was the only thing involved, but the RECORD shows otherwise. I misunderstood the question of the gentleman from Alabama, but in view of the situation I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute amendment offered by him to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts striking out the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that would not be a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an independent motion. If it has been agreed here by all the parties concerned and there has been unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may withdraw his amendment, then section 1 is not subject to any amendment, because we are not considering section 1, and that entire section is eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment striking out all of the first paragraph of section 1, to which the gentleman from Texas offered a substitute. No amendment is pending with reference to the elimination of the entire section.

Mr. DOXEY. Then, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Texas, I am sure, in the interest of harmony and expedition, the gentleman from Massachusetts will also

ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment so we can proceed with the consideration of section 2.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If it is agreeable to the chairman of the committee, I will change my motion and move to strike out the entire section.

Mr. MILLER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts modifying his original amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Page 1, beginning at line 3, strike out all of section 1.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the cotton farmers have a chance to vote on the question of a choice between two forms of aid. The last vote they had was to vote for the Bankhead plan or vote against any form of aid, or at least they understood it that way.

Oklahoma ranks from third to fifth in the production of cotton. I know how many backaches there are in a bale of cotton. I have chopped, it seems like, a hundred miles of cotton; and when the cotton farmers were faced with the situation of voting for this Bankhead plan, which was the only aid available as they saw it, or voting no, which seemed like cutting off all hope of aid, they voted for the Bankhead plan.

The Bankhead plan has been criticized, but it has helped. We were in an emergency. It needs no apology. A great Government has done a great good for the cotton farmers, but we should make progress, and I hope we do make progress in this matter.

I personally favor the domestic allotment plan.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman that if we strike out the entire section at the present time, unquestionably this legislation will be here again before Congress adjourns and at that time the gentleman could offer any proposal he may have in mind with respect to a questionnaire.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. I hope to finish my remarks at this time.

Cotton farmers, as has already been said, are in a desperate condition. Cotton pickers for years have been making enough cash money by picking cotton to grubstake them for the next crop. This year they were on relief. I favor the domestic allotment plan, because it will return to the farmer his rightful prerogative of putting in the amount of cotton he wants to. Today I introduced a bill to that effect, giving him a Government benefit on the amount of cotton that is used domestically and letting him produce what he wants to. The price of world cotton will automatically curtail production. No man who knows the drudgery of raising cotton, when he is confronted with the proposition of raising some cotton at a profit and the rest at a loss, is going to raise much cotton at a loss. He may put in enough to have a safe margin in order that he may get the benefit of the total amount allotted to him, but he will not run away with production.

Perhaps you are thinking that he did overproduce before the passage of the Bankhead law, but I point out that then he was faced with the proposition of raising no cotton at all or else raising it all at a loss, whereas, under my plan, he would receive Government benefits on that amount allotted to him to produce for domestic consumption, thus emphasizing the fact that he was losing on the amount he produced above his allotment. The result would be that he would diversify his crops and curtail his own production according to the world market price of cotton.

We are losing our world markets. Already this season we have exported 2,350,000 less bales than we did over the same period last season, and the exportation a year ago was considerably less than it has been in the past.

In order to raise the price of cotton the United States cut down her production, but other nations increased. We re-

treated while they advance and the market has not been materially helped.

I do not believe we should teach Russia how to power-farm on a grand scale and then give her the world markets. I believe we ought to go out and knock on their doors and ask for their trade, and we ought to have an exportable surplus that would give us something to sell them.

We should give our farmers an outright Government benefit on that amount of their crop which is produced for domestic use and then sell the remainder to the other nations at what we can get for it. If we will stop trying to hold prices up artificially and offer our commodities to the world at a price where the other nations can buy, we can sell to them. From the world standpoint there is no such thing yet as overproduction. It is rather underconsumption.

Why, last year 4,000,000 people starved to death for the want of bread in China and India, and here in America we starved because we had too much.

I believe that the emergency has partially passed and that the time has come when we should have a permanent program that will go out and get foreign markets. Then, when the other nations are willing to meet America and divide the world markets, we will be in a better position to get that part of the world trade that rightly belongs to us. If we sell our surplus commodities at a price that other nations can afford to pay, we will thereby create greater markets by increasing the consumption of wheat and cotton. Why, there are 450,000,000 Chinamen. If we could persuade them to lengthen their shirt tails half an inch, it would absorb our cotton surplus overnight. [Laughter and applause.]

I would like to see us look forward to a permanent solution of this problem by substituting the plan of an outright Government benefit to the farmer on his allotted amount and removing all limitations on his production, such as is contained in the bill which I introduced today.

By so doing you will first remove the objectionable limitations on production, and return to the farmer the freedom of planting what he wishes and as much as he wishes.

Second, you will save the expense of paying rentals on land not in cultivation.

Third, you will regain our foreign markets.

Fourth, you will give employment to the millions of cotton pickers who are now on relief.

Fifth, you will give employment to the almost 2,000,000 persons normally employed in the ginning, compressing, transporting, and handling of cotton.

Sixth, you will restore the natural operation of the law of supply and demand and prevent market crashes like the one just experienced, because it was thought that the Government was not going to loan further on cotton.

Finally, you will make the production of cotton profitable to the farmer by the payment of the benefit, thereby restoring to him the dignity of running his own farm.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the farmers have a chance to vote on this domestic allotment plan. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the understanding about the amendment, I had the impression it was the first paragraph that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered to strike out. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia, I did not have the bill before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to strike out the first section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton is less than 2 bales for the crop year 1935-36, there shall be exempt from the tax imposed under this act so much of the cotton harvested on such land during such crop year as is in excess of the allotment, but not in excess of 2 bales. For the purpose of making effective the benefits of this subsection, in the case of land cultivated by a tenant or share cropper, if the allotment to such land to a person as owner thereof would be less than 2 bales, the allotment shall be made to and the exemption certificates shall be issued to the tenant or share cropper. No producer shall be entitled to exemption certificates on the amount of cotton exempt from tax under this subsection, but,

upon proof of the right to exemption under this subsection in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, bale tags shall be issued for such cotton. For the crop year 1935-36 the quantity of cotton which the Secretary of Agriculture determines under section 3 (a) should be allotted shall include the amount which the Secretary of Agriculture estimates will be tax exempt under this subsection and the amount of cotton apportioned under section 3 (b) shall be the amount of the allotment so determined minus the amount of tax-exempt cotton so estimated."

(b) Section 23 of such act, as amended (relating to the definition of "bale"), is amended by inserting after "3," in the last sentence thereof "4 (h)."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out the period following the word "bales", insert a comma, and the following: "3 bales (if the allotment is 2 bales or more but less than 3 bales); 4 bales (if the allotment is 3 bales or more or less than 4 bales), as the case may be."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not going to take much of your time, but we have been talking about the small farmer and what has been done to that class of farmers, usually with large families, who, because of poverty, are able to produce only 1, 2, 3, 4, or even 5 bales of cotton. Under my amendment we will remedy this situation, and the farmer that grows 1, 1½, 1¾ bales, or where he grows 3 bales, he does not get any more under my amendment than the difference between his allotment and the number of bales I propose to give him. If his base production is, say, 6 bales, and if his allotment is 3 bales or a little more, we give him 4 bales.

The only difference is that the small amount between 2½ and 2 bales is to make it 3, between 3 and 3¼ bales to make it 4, and it would not amount to 150,000 bales of cotton. Certainly this would come from the large cotton farmer such as we have in the Delta section of Mississippi, and be given to small farmers in the hill section of Mississippi, and this would apply in each State. This would help to give to that little farmer a few more dollars that he may be able to pay his taxes, and buy some clothes for his children. It would take away from the fellow who has been getting the benefit under the original bill, being able to walk around with tax-exempt certificates, a large rent check, and a large parity check. This will not amount to what the Department of Agriculture has told you with regard to 2 bales. It is only the small difference after the allotment has been made.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman refers to the man who has title to his own land. He, of course, will benefit by this bill, but what about the man who does not own any land, who has heretofore been a tenant farmer? Will the gentleman tell what his fate is?

Mr. FULMER. He is the fellow that I am trying to help, the fellow that rents a small farm or that owns a little piece of land—a farmer who does not farm like myself, with 20 tenants on my farm.

Mr. CULKIN. What I do not understand is how this amendment which the gentleman proposes, and I know he does so in good faith, reinstates the tenant farmer in a new lease.

Mr. FULMER. It would give him that extra little amount over and above the allotment given him under the program.

Mr. CULKIN. That must be the act of the owner of the land—the landlord.

Mr. FULMER. It does not apply to the landlord, unless he is a little 4-bale farmer, or a smaller farmer.

Mr. CULKIN. So, so far as the landlord is concerned, the situation of the tenant farmer is the same as it was before.

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely, unless his allotment is less than 3 or 4 bales.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We may just as well have a clear understanding about this matter. If we are going to amend the bill in such fashion as this, the bill may just as well be abandoned; and I ask everyone who is interested in having some provision made for the small share-cropper, the small tenant, the small landowner, to vote against this amendment. The Pres-

ident practically made the statement before the vote was taken last fall that there would be a 2-bale exemption. We are trying to keep faith with that promise; and if you load this bill down with amendments, there will not be any legislation. You will be back where your tenants with 300 or 400 pounds or 1 bale would have only that amount. Are you for that provision, or are you for playing to the gallery? That is the whole thing at issue. There are 2,400,000 producers of cotton. They produced last year less than 5 bales each, on an average. They ordinarily produce between 5 and 6 bales. Any man who thinks this thing through must realize that if we are to have a program we must stay within the range of reason. Do you want a program, or do you want to make it seem as if you want to do a whole lot more and get nothing done? That is the issue here, and that is all.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute amendment for the Fulmer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. MILLER for the amendment of Mr. FULMER: Strike out the word "two", in lines 18 and 22, on page 2, and in line 1, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the Committee for just a few minutes to reply briefly to some remarks by the beloved Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JONES. I may be charged with playing to the gallery by undertaking to amend this bill and with wrecking the act, but justice to the host of small farmers is all I am asking by this amendment. To be perfectly frank with you, I do not want to wreck the Bankhead Cotton Control Act. It is the only bill that has passed the Congress since I have been here upon which I made two or three speeches. At the time we were considering the original bill I took for granted that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration would equitably and rightfully administer the law. That has not been done, and the only way to correct that is to put into the law the amount of bales that must be exempted to the share-cropper, the small farmer, and to the tenant. You cannot avoid the human equation in this question. We cannot afford to starve the tenant and other small farmers of this Nation. We cannot afford to pauperize the small landowner and enrich the plantation owner. The Bankhead Cotton Act is, in its provisions, all right, but here is your trouble—it has not been justly, fairly, and equitably administered. They say that this will mean the wrecking of the act. It will not mean the wrecking of the act.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not a fact that with the little renter who does not own any land, who gets 2 bales exemption, it takes practically every bale to pay his rent?

Mr. MILLER. Let me give you the situation. Here is a man who has four or five children in his family. He obtains 2 bales of cotton. He is a share-cropper. He must pay half of that to his landlord. That leaves him 1 bale, or \$50, and that is what he receives from his summer's work in producing that cotton.

The Bankhead Act was not intended, and we were assured of it, to penalize that man and put him on the relief roll; yet it has done just exactly that. The reason it has done it is because the great producers of cotton in this country have through its administration been able to obtain satisfactory allotments at the expense of the small producer. They have succeeded in having the Secretary of Agriculture utterly disregard subsection 3 of section 7 of the original law. Mind you, this was the thing that caught us boys representing hill districts and small-farm districts when we were supporting the Bankhead cotton bill. I took it at its face value. This is what it says:

Upon such basis as the Secretary of Agriculture deems fair and just and will apply to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph uniformly, within the county, on the basis or classification adopted. The Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the manner of allotment to individual farmers, shall pro-

vide that the farmers who have voluntarily reduced their cotton acreage shall not be penalized in favor of those farmers who have not done so.

Yet they have been penalized, and nobody will deny it. You take the hill section of Arkansas or the hill section of every other cotton-producing State in this Nation, and those men have constantly over a period of years reduced their cotton to the amount that is absolutely necessary to sustain themselves and their families; yet the owners of the plantations in the Delta area have grown exclusively cotton. The Secretary in making the allotments utterly disregarded the law and failed to take into account these facts. The result is that the small producer has been and is being seriously damaged while the plantation owner was not materially reduced and not more than he should have been willing to reduce.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES. In connection with that I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at the end of that time. This is not closing debate except on this amendment.

Mr. McFARLANE. Reserving the right to object, I want to speak on this amendment, and I hope the gentleman will not make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I want to speak on this amendment also. I think this is the most important amendment in this bill.

Mr. JONES. Very well, I will withdraw the request for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. The adoption of this amendment will not wreck the Bankhead Cotton Act at all. This is what it will do: An allotment is made to a State of so many bales of cotton. That allotment is then apportioned and allotted to the various counties. From whom is this exemption taken? It is taken from the amount apportioned to the county. This amendment will compel the Secretary to enforce the original law as it was written and the 3-bale exemption will be taken from the big producer, that man who has in the past arbitrarily refused to voluntarily reduce his acreage. This will give to the small producer who has heretofore actually and in good faith cooperated in every movement to reduce the production of cotton.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman believes that in order to save the little fellow, this amendment is essential to the bill?

Mr. MILLER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. CULKIN. As the law is now, the little man is discriminated against?

Mr. MILLER. He is penalized. He is worse than discriminated against.

Mr. CULKIN. He is penalized and driven into the earth?

Mr. MILLER. Absolutely. Now, I want to appeal to the sense of fairness of the membership of this House that this amendment be adopted. Do not be scared by the bugaboo or the threat that it means the abandonment of this bill or its veto. The President may favor only 2 bales exemption, but that is not sufficient and we must, as Members of Congress, exercise our own judgment.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. And is it not a fact that the large cotton producer can produce his cotton much cheaper than the small "one horse" cotton farmer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. The operations of the great cotton producers are highly and efficiently mechanized and they can cheaply produce cotton. They can even pay the tax and then make more clear money than the small farmer can on

exempt cotton. They are the men who have brought about our trouble and not the little man nor the tenant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The provision which the gentleman read in the former bill that the Secretary of Agriculture should not discriminate against these small farmers who had already reduced their acreage was my amendment, and I want to agree with the gentleman that it has not been enforced.

Mr. MILLER. It has not been enforced. There is the trouble.

I want to see somebody in charge of the Department of Agriculture who does not lose sight of that tenant and that share-cropper and that small farmer—who, after all, constitute the backbone of our Nation. Under the original act these men should have better treatment. They were discriminated against, and I am not willing to leave this matter in the discretion of anyone. I say frankly to you—and I am just as serious as I ever was in my life about anything—that if agriculture is to be maintained in the South, and if we are to maintain harmony among our people, we must give to every class of them, whether they be share-croppers or plantation owners or whatnot, an opportunity to earn a living for themselves and their families. [Applause.] I appeal to you to support the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I sent an identical amendment to the Clerk's desk a moment ago. When the Bankhead cotton bill was introduced originally notice was served on the cotton buyers of the world to look for a substitute for cotton in one of two forms, either in the form of material that is not cotton, to take its place, or in the form of a substitute field on which to grow cotton. Immediately the cotton-buying world outside continental United States began to look for that substitute. The figures are before us today as to what has happened. The balance of the world has taken our export market away from us; the southern cotton farmer has been seriously injured as borne out by the debate here today, and the Bankhead Cotton Act has failed.

I know something about the cotton business. I know what men mean when they speak about blocking and thinning and picking cotton. I know that 2 bales' exemption is not sufficient to feed and clothe and shelter the small share croppers who rent lands for one-half of the return, who go to the commissary stores and purchase their bacon, their lard, and their meal. So much has been said on this floor in times past about the bad working conditions in the beet fields of the North. Yet we have Members here today who are voting against this 3-bale exemption provision which leaves the cotton-growing family with less than \$75 cash income per year for the whole family. If this is not injustice; if this is not unfair dealing to the little farmer in the South; if this is not starvation wages for him and his family to limit them to only 3 bales—I ask what is it? Three bales is not sufficient to protect these small cotton growers and landowners from great suffering, but it is 50 percent more than the bill now provides for, and it is 50 percent more than the President has indicated. At least it will help some.

I know that 3 bales will not wreck the structure. If taking the small farmer and share-croppers off the welfare list will wreck the structure, perhaps it should be wrecked. If the structure is to wreck the great cotton South, perhaps it is not so good to preserve the structure. Three bales' exemption will not wreck the structure from the standpoint of excess production. No figures have been presented to show that would happen, and I am in favor of the 3-bale exemption. As the gentleman from Arkansas has said, it is necessary to make the bill effective to protect the small grower of cotton. It is perfectly natural for the large operator and farmer to claim 3 bales will wreck the structure. Such a plea is always made by the large operator. In spite of what the Chief Executive has said with reference to the 2 bales, and with all due respect to what he did have to say,

I hope the House will support the 3-bale amendment to the end that the people down there in the cotton South may use some discretion with reference to producing enough cotton to keep their bodies and souls together, and to the end that a little more cotton may be produced with which to recover some of the world markets. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment, a substitute amendment, and an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The only amendments in order at this time are perfecting amendments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I merely serve notice at this time, then, that I shall offer such an amendment.

LET US ADOPT THE 3-BALE EXEMPTION—THAT IS LITTLE ENOUGH FOR THE SMALL FARMER TO LIVE ON

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt this 3-bale exemption.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is this a 3-bale or a 5-bale exemption?

Mr. McFARLANE. The substitute now pending is the amendment offered by Mr. MILLER and I am heartily in favor of his 3-bale exemption amendment.

Mr. DOXEY. That is not before the House.

Mr. McFARLANE. Let us understand each other. I think the gentleman's amendment was to increase the exemption from 2 to 3 bales.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, for the information of the Committee, the Clerk will again read the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

There being no objection the Clerk again read the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now pending would allow the share croppers and the tenant farmers of the Cotton Belt to grow 3 bales of cotton without paying the processing tax. I know and you know that you cannot keep body and soul together on less than this.

I do not know of any reason why this Congress should not recognize fundamental facts. You say "2 bales of cotton" when you know, if you will just stop and analyze the situation, that a man and his wife and two, three, four, or half a dozen children cannot begin to live on that. In the South cotton is recognized as the one money crop the farmer has, and if you tax him to death on this crop you have made it impossible for the farmer to begin to buy the necessities of life. Why not recognize this fundamental principle? You say if you adopt this amendment it will throw the plan out of adjustment. Why, Members in the Cotton Belt here on the floor are winking at each other. We might as well drive the nigger out of the woodpile. If you adopt this additional limitation as it is written in this bill it is going to take some of the cotton allotment from these big cotton plantations and corporation farms; it is going to take a little bit of "gravy" out of their platter. That is all there is to it. Now, let us recognize the rule of right; that is all there is to it, and we ought to be willing to do that. If you do not recognize this principle and liberalize this section some, I predict that it will not be long until the cotton farmers of the South will come here and demand it be done. If you do this you are going to vote for at least a 3-bale exemption, and in the absence of domestic allotment legislation that we are all in doubt about at this time, I hope that this Congress will go on record favoring at least a 3-bale exemption so that this poor tenant farmer and share cropper, who is trying to keep body and soul together, trying to keep his self-respect, and trying to keep off relief rolls, will have a chance to do so; but he cannot do it if you do not give him at least 3 bales' exemption from the tax. [Applause.]

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] providing that 3 bales shall be exempt to all growers and producers of cotton from tax under the Bankhead Act.

Before adoption of the Bankhead Act cotton was selling for less than 6 cents per pound. Not long after the adoption of the Bankhead Act cotton was bringing 10 cents a pound, and it is now pegged at 12 cents a pound by the Government. It therefore appears that as an emergency measure this law has been a salvation to the cotton farmers of our country, but I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to some very important things regarding the future of our cotton industry. Since the Bankhead Act has been in force cotton production in the United States has decreased about 43 percent, while cotton production in India has increased about 8 percent; in Brazil, nearly 22 percent; and in Egypt, 68 percent. America's export trade has dropped about 50 percent. The statistics show that during the last 2 years millions of dollars' worth of our improved farm machinery has been shipped to foreign countries, and that those foreign countries have employed our experts at high salaries to teach them how to produce more cotton. I am afraid that we will not accomplish very much if we cut the production of cotton in this country by compulsory methods while the foreign countries increase their production. Heretofore we have been able to export about 60 percent of the cotton produced in the United States, but in recent years our export trade has dropped considerably, and I think we should give serious consideration to this matter. I am glad to see the provision of the bill continuing the act for the crop year 1936-37 eliminated by the agreement of the Committee on Agriculture until we can give further consideration to the matter.

Mr. Chairman, while the Bankhead Act has been of great value as an emergency measure in restoring the price of cotton, it has also worked many hardships on the small landowner and tenant farmers of our country, and I commend the forethought and efforts of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], the author of this bill, in bringing a measure before this Congress in order that we might vote some relief to the small cotton producers, however, I am constrained to agree with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] and say that it would be much better if Congress would exempt 3 bales to every producer instead of 2 as provided in the bill.

Some few years ago the Department of Agriculture, through the various agricultural colleges and extension agents in the cotton-producing States began to teach the cotton farmers that they should diversify instead of trying to grow so much cotton. About that time a move was started by some of the cattle growers of the Northwest to sell high-priced dairy cattle to the southern cotton farmers, and they joined in with the extension forces and sold the idea to the small cotton farmers that they should go into the dairy business and grow more feed and less cotton. The result was that long before the Bankhead Act was enacted, the small landowners and tenant farmers of Mississippi and every other cotton-producing State had already cut their cotton acreage, while the large landowners, and particularly the ones living in the fertile sections, continued to plant every available acre in cotton. Because the small farmer followed the advice of the agricultural leaders and diversified his crops he found that when a 5-year average was established as a basis of tax-free quota his allotment was far too small to meet his demands for the necessities of life. The discriminations in this connection from which the small farmers have suffered is everywhere evident in the cotton-growing States and we must take some action to remedy this situation and restore their rights.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I gladly yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. The Bankhead bill is supposed to be self-sustaining, is it not?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. That is true.

Mr. HOOK. I want to secure some information, because I am from the North and I desire to go along with the boys in the cotton industry. I do not know anything about the cotton industry and I want to get some information.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I will gladly give the gentleman any information that he desires.

Mr. HOOK. If we allow this extra bale exemption, will the Bankhead bill still be self-sustaining?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. It will. There will be no change in the allotment to the counties. It will take a little off of the allotment that has heretofore been made to the big producer and will give the little producer, who has been diversifying and cutting his acreage in the past, a chance for a fair allotment with the 3-bale exemption.

Mr. Chairman, by a vote taken last fall the farmers approved the continuance of the Bankhead Act, but this was done because they were given the assurance that their Senators and Representatives in Congress would take immediate action to remove the discriminations against the small producer. I hope we will live up to our plain duty in this matter and vote to remove these restrictions. I say this because I realize that the cotton crop is the only source from which the southern farmer can obtain funds with which to pay his taxes, meet his cash obligations and provide for his family. It is with this thought in mind that I contend that the 2-bale exemption is not sufficient, and I plead with you to grant a more liberal basis than that. A 3-bale exemption is also insufficient, but the force of circumstances dictates that we accept that if nothing better can obtain. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a fact which I think will interest every Member. In the issue of Fiber and Fabric of December 22 is a very interesting story about raising cotton in New England. This cotton was raised in my own district 18 miles east of my own home. I had the pleasure of watching that cotton grow, seeing the plants blossom, and I have here a sample of the cotton picked.

Up in New England we used to sing the old favorite song about how we wished we were "in the land of cotton", but if we keep on up there in New England we will have cotton plantations right in our own back yards.

Mr. Chairman, I have here pictures which show the cotton plantation referred to. While this was only an experiment, and it was at first very doubtful whether or not the cotton would actually blossom and grow to maturity, it was successfully carried out by Mr. Victor Depres, who owns and lives on the old estate where Eli Whitney, the inventor of the cotton gin was born.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the legislation under consideration. I think we ought to have an exemption of 3 or 4 bales. Here is some cotton that was picked in my district and although we always thought it was impossible to raise cotton so far north in Massachusetts the experiment was rather successful. The seed was not planted before May 10, and on August 11 the first blossoms appeared on these vines. The lower ones came first, and they matured first. I believe we have to do something up in my section of the country to help offset some of these processing taxes, and I think for future experiments it will be of some value to our producers in Massachusetts to get this exemption, so that they can raise 3 or 4 bales and have them tax exempt. Having that amount tax exempt I think will go a long way to help them cultivate and also to further experiment on this matter of planting and growing cotton.

I hope that the Massachusetts State Agricultural College will take this matter up, and go more extensively into the possibilities we have up there for the raising of cotton, so that we may enlarge our production of cotton, not only in Massachusetts, but carry it into New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The Chairman of the Agricultural Committee stated awhile ago that there are 2,400,000 small producers of cotton—5 bales or less. In this connection the gentleman wants to add 1 more to his figures and made it 2,400,001.

I thought the Members of the House might be interested in seeing these pictures and in seeing cotton actually produced in my district, 18 miles from my own home. I have taken a great deal of interest this past season in watching Mr. Depres develop and plant this experimental acreage which he has so successfully done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to speak in favor of this amendment and will require 2 or 3 minutes at least.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important part of this bill. After we get through this section it will not take long to finish the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that they are talking this bill to death. We have until 5 o'clock to pass it. We will have the bonus bill before us the rest of the week. If the gentlemen insist on talking 5 minutes, they are going to bring about the death of this legislation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to change my unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that all debates on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. NICHOLS. Reserving the right to object. If I have 5 minutes in which to make some remarks in reference to this amendment I shall not object. Otherwise I will be forced to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. NICHOLS. I object.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an amendment to that motion that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLER) there were—ayes 86, noes 36.

So the amendment to the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in order that a number of the Members may have time, I ask unanimous consent that under this limitation all speeches be limited to 3 minutes instead of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments which are now pending to increase the exemption above 2 bales will not prevail.

I am one of those who opposed the Bankhead bill when it came up last year. I am still opposed to the principle of that bill, but if we are going to have a measure of this kind, we ought to do everything we can to make a success, and, at least, we should not do anything deliberately which will have the effect of preventing the purpose of the act from being carried out.

There is a very good reason, I think, for providing for this 2-bale exemption, and that is that the President of the United States before the referendum was had on the Bankhead bill last fall made a statement in which he said there would be a 2-bale exemption granted to the small farmer, and relying upon this statement, the referendum resulted in an affirmative vote of about 9 to 1 in favor of a continuation

of the act. This is all that was promised. Everyone who voted to continue the act relied upon a 2-bale exemption, but no one had any right to rely upon there being any larger exemption than 2 bales.

Even a 2-bale exemption, according to the figures which have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture, will result in an increase in cotton production this year. They do not have figures covering the entire cotton section, but for the State of North Carolina, which we may assume is typical of the cotton-growing sections, a 2-bale exemption would result in an increase of 31 percent in the cotton acreage this year over last. If you have a 3-bale exemption or a 4-bale exemption, it can very readily be seen there will be a still greater increase.

If you believe that a 2-bale exemption is not sufficient, then it seems to me you ought to take the position that we should repeal the entire Bankhead bill, because the hardships, which are incident to the enforcement of this act, are the result of the logic of the bill itself.

In passing this 2-bale exemption we are doing all that has been promised and all that can reasonably be expected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire on this occasion to take up much time, and in order to save time I call attention to the fact that I have just sent an amendment to the Clerk's desk, striking out all of section 2.

Candidly, I feel if exemptions are necessary under this law, possibly my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is correct, and the law should be repealed.

In my candid opinion, Mr. Chairman, if we are to have equality of privilege in this land of ours we should be willing to assume equality of obligation.

Unquestionably, we have definite evidence of many failures and mistakes in various laws we have passed, but one thing remains definite and proven, that at the time the Bankhead Act was passed we had cotton bales then worth around \$37. Not so very long ago they were up to \$80. The 2-bale farmer was better off with 1 bale 10 days ago than he was a little over a year ago with 2 bales.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the effort to consider this bill, dividing us again into classes, which seems to be a popular pastime now, will not only endanger the price of the South's greatest agricultural product, but, as a matter of fact, will lend fuel to the fire which seems to be prone to burst now and again, dividing this country of ours into distinctions, denominations, and classes.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House wants to see this country of ours a better United States, wants to see this country a richer United States, and I am sure that every thinking Member wants to see this country a fairer United States and a more intelligent United States. This can best be done by not indulging in the fallacious idea that one may have his pie and eat it, too, and for this reason, and without more ado, when the time comes I shall ask the Chair for a vote on my amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not been in absolute accord with the provisions of the Bankhead law. I favor the domestic allotment plan, but the Bankhead law is the program we have and I am in favor of this bill, because I think it is an improvement and makes changes that will be beneficial and because it undertakes to speak the will of the Congress.

The original act delegated the power and authority to the Administrator to make the allotments. You thought you placed a provision in it whereby the small farmer would be taken care of, but you are here today saying the way the act was construed and administered he has not been protected. Therefore, I favor the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. MILLER] exempting three bales to the small farmer. By adopting this amendment Congress will speak its will in unmistakable terms, giving him the protection he is entitled to, and I do not believe the language of this act including this amendment will be susceptible of two constructions or interpretations.

This is a step in the right direction, because when we legislate, as far as possible, we should speak the will of this

body plainly and with such positive language that some executive charged with the duty of administering the law cannot place an interpretation or construction that in effect defeats the intention and very purpose of the law. I believe that Congress has the intelligence to say what it means and the courage to mean what it says.

In my district many small farmers had allotments of 1 bale and less. That, Mr. Chairman, means a money crop of \$50 and less for whole families. It is obvious that this is wholly inadequate, and as a result many of these farmers and their families are now on relief, as has been stated here this afternoon. If granted a 3-bale exemption it will have the effect of restoring many to a position where they will be self-sustaining. They are not on relief by choice. They have been reduced to this unhappy status by circumstances beyond their control. They prefer to work to produce and earn a livelihood. The enactment of this bill with the 3-bale exemption amendment will restore to many this opportunity.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is necessary. If no legislation is enacted and the Bankhead law is left to the Secretary of Agriculture and those under him charged with its administration, in my judgment, the small farmer will again be penalized this crop year. By the enactment of this bill we take away some of the discretionary powers delegated in the original act, and instead direct how the act should be administered to better protect those who are in dire distress and require this help.

Based on the experience we have gained in the operation of the Bankhead law thus far, I am convinced we can adopt this amendment without doing violence to the whole program. It is not our purpose to obstruct or hinder, but rather to assist, aid, and protect those who need this help. We can give relief in this way. If we deny it, we will add to the length of the relief rolls.

Let us adopt this amendment and then pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said he understood the President was in favor of this legislation. I do not so understand. The Director, Division of Cotton, and other officials of the Agricultural Administration are not in favor of it. On the contrary, they are opposed to it. They speak for the administration.

Now, much has been said about taking the allotment from the large producer and giving it to the small producer. There is just as much reason in saying that you are going to take the production away from Texas and give it to other States as to make that statement. The bill makes no change in the basis of allotment. The same yardstick applies to all States and to all farmers, whether large or small.

It is said that we have large plantations in Mississippi, but we also have small farms, and there are more tenants and share croppers on the large plantations than on the small farms. Mr. Chairman, I would like to exempt 3 bales, but the chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES] says it would wreck the program. Mr. JONES says to increase the exemption from 2 to 3 bales would wreck the program. Mr. Cobb says that to extend the exemption to the tenant and share cropper would wreck the program. I prefer to follow the President.

That will accomplish just exactly what the President of the United States wanted us to do in his statement of December 5. Mr. Chairman, I submit that I am governed by the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. I have a statement here that was furnished me by Mr. Cobb, the Director, on the 15th of March 1935. It says:

It is obvious for the reasons presented that in order to allot anything for an equitable quantity of tax-exemption certificates to producers growing on the average more than 2 bales of cotton, it will be necessary to raise the national allotment of 10,500,000 bales to a figure higher than the national allotment already determined by a quantity estimated at some two to three million bales. The result would tend to nullify the effect of the Bankhead Act.

Mr. Cobb is the spokesman for the Administration. I am willing, under the Kieberg amendment, to leave it to the

Administration, because they have provided for the 2-bale farm just as the President promised. If you go further, you will have to take it from the 4-bale or the 5-bale farm, you will have to take it from Texas and give it to Arkansas, or from Arkansas and give it to North Carolina in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. Possibly if I lived down in his section, with the large plantations, I would take the same position that he does; but I do not live in that section. I see this from the viewpoint of the small operator, the farmer who grows only 2 or 10 bales of cotton, and I know that he is the man who is being penalized in the present law. According to the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi, the little, struggling corner grocery could operate as cheaply as does the big chain store. His philosophy does not pan out. If I lived in southern Texas and had a million-acre farm, like my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], I would probably be favoring the same kind of an amendment that he has offered; but I do not happen to own a million-acre farm or have any constituents who do. So, obviously, we do not all see things alike. I have notified the committee that I have prepared an amendment to exempt the first 4 bales, and at least a dozen or more Members have told me that they propose to support that amendment. I appeal to all of you who have said you will support the amendment to exempt 4 bales to support this pending amendment. If we cannot get 4 bales, that now, I regret to say, seems obvious, let us do the next best by exempting 3 bales.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. If we adopt the 3-table amendment, the only effect it will have will be to take that bale additional off these big cotton farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McFARLANE. And that is the reason they are howling for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is the situation.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I believe, suggested that there is no argument in saying that simply because the producer is a big producer he ought to be held down and the smaller producer benefited. I submit that the same argument would contend that your little corner grocery store can produce as well and just as cheaply as the largest corporation in the country. That will lead to corporation and syndicate farming. There ought to be a progressive reduction or allotment even above the 4-table exemption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, is absolutely right about it. Unless something is done to relieve the small cotton farmer, we will soon have syndicated and corporation farming in the South to a much larger extent than we now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, let us see what this terrible thing is that we are about to do. What is this gigantic program in which we are about to indulge, which is of such proportion that it will wreck the entire program of the A. A. A.? Do you know what it means? They have suggested that you give a farmer a 2-bale exemption. Do you know how much that is? That is \$100. This amendment would give him a 3-bale exemption and would give him an additional \$50 a year. If there is any Member of this House who will tell me that he thinks that a man who works in the fields all the summer long to raise cotton is not entitled to at least \$150 a year, then let that Member be the first to vote against this amendment. That is all this amendment does.

Does anyone mean to tell me that this cotton farmer, who takes his little children and wife out at sunup in the morning and goes to the field and with the brawn of his muscle plants and harvests the cotton, is not entitled to protection to the tune of \$150 a year? If this House is willing continually to go on record to pass legislation to protect the wages of the laboring man, if this House is willing continually to go on record and provide subsidies for the big industries of the country, then why is not the little tenant farmer down here entitled to the protection of \$150 a year? Oh, no; \$50 a year will not tear this plan down. One bale of cotton will not stop the operation of this plan; and, if it will, well, it is probably time that we started protecting in a serious manner some of these folks we do so much talking about giving protection to. A good average price for cotton is 10 cents a pound. Cotton weighs 500 pounds to the bale, generally. All you are doing is telling that man he can have \$150. I will tell you what I think you ought to do. I think you ought to raise the penalty in this bill from 50 percent to 75 percent. The way it is now, this bill really stops the small cotton farmer of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and the other cotton States from selling any cotton over his allowable; but you gentlemen who have in your districts the plantations of the South, where you raise cotton in hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of acres, plant it with machinery, never chop a stalk of it, pick it with machinery, can sell over and above your allowable with a 5-percent penalty and still make money; and we are absolutely prohibited from it. I hope you will support this 3-bale amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. I want to clarify my remarks above, wherein I state that I think the penalty should be raised from 50 percent to 75 percent.

I would at this time offer an amendment to that effect were it not for the fact that that section of the original act is not now under consideration, and were I to offer the amendment at this time the same would be held not germane; but I wish to serve notice upon the House of Representatives that before the session is over I propose to offer an amendment to the original act which will raise the penalty from 50 percent to 75 percent. My reason is this:

The small cotton farmer who farms by hand generally tends only from 10 to 40 to 80 acres of land, and it costs him as much money to plant and harvest a crop of cotton on this small acreage as it does the plantation farmer to plant and harvest a crop of several hundred acres, because the plantation farmer plants and harvests his crop with modern machinery, while the small farmer plants by hand and tends and harvests his crop by hand.

For example, say, cotton is selling at 10 cents per pound; the small farmer can make a little money at 10-cent cotton, but he absolutely cannot make any money at 5-cent cotton. Therefore, the 50-percent penalty prohibits him from selling any cotton above his allotment, while the plantation farmer, who plants and harvests his crop with modern machinery, has several hundred acres of cotton to sell, if he can get 10 cents a pound for his allotment of cotton.

Then, by reason of his great production, he can sell the remainder of his crop, above his allotment, at 5 cents per pound, and still make a little money.

Thus, the very purpose of the Cotton Control Act is defeated because the purpose of the act was to limit the amount of cotton placed on both the domestic and the world market for consumption, and as long as the plantation farmer can realize any profit above his allowable, the market will continue to be flooded by overproduction of cotton.

Therefore, I say that the penalty should be raised to a sufficient percentage, that the plantation farmer could not profitably market any cotton above his allotment, and thus put his own at parity with the small cotton farmers of eastern Oklahoma, and other like sections of the cotton country.

In supporting the present amendment, which provides for the exemption of 3 bales, I want to say to the members of the committee that in my opinion this is not adequate.

I am of the opinion that there should be a 5-bale exemption granted and in that connection I wish to state that it is not the 5- and 6-bale cotton producer who floods the market with a surplussage of cotton. Your surplussage of cotton, and the flooding of the market, is caused by the plantation growers of the South who dump literally thousands of bales of cotton on the market off of a single farm, and who could well exempt 5 bales and permit a man to earn \$250, without being penalized, and still not hurt the A. A. A., nor the operation of the Cotton Control Act.

I therefore sincerely trust that since it looks as though it would be impossible from the votes that have been recorded heretofore on this bill to get a 5-bale exemption, that you folks will, by your vote, stay with the small cotton farmer and give him this 3-bale exemption.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I never came on this floor and asked a favor. I am not doing it today. But I am coming here to ask a very small measure of justice to a part of my country that has been overlooked in this cotton bill. I was for the Bankhead bill. I thought it was right. I think it is right now. But when a great overflow paralyzed the industry in my district and then when we had three droughts it cut us so deeply that we were only allowed 619 bales by allotment. I come and say to you that only as a matter of fairness and decency we ought to be given exactly the same kind of deal that was obtained for California and Missouri under the Bankhead bill originally. I am asking that. I hope you will all remember that I have not come here asking favors. I am not asking a favor today, but I am asking it as a matter of justice. I cannot stop a drought any more than anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not this plan working?

Mr. KELLER. It is working to this extent, that down in my district, where we had three droughts one after another, and a great overflow, it paralyzed us so that when we had to go on a 5-year average from 1927 to 1932 it only left us 619 bales instead of 4,000, as should have been given us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the Bankhead bill fixed everything.

Mr. KELLER. Well, it did not fix everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KELLER. I have here the official figures. I am not doing any guesswork. I hope when the Clerk reads my amendment you will remember that I have not asked any favors, and I am only asking the same thing for my little spot of cotton down in Illinois that the rest of you have for yours. I trust it will be given to me when that amendment is called up. I hope you will not forget it. I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report for information the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The Clerk again reported the Fulmer amendment and the substitute amendment offered by Mr. Miller.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 91 and noes 52.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] as modified by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is this vote on the amendment as it was amended by the adoption of the substitute which was just voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then a vote "no" on this amendment will be exactly as a vote "no" on the previous amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], as modified by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were ayes 93 and noes 49.

So the amendment, as modified by the substitute amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out section 2 (lines 15 to 25 on page 2 and lines 1 to 19 on page 3) and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) If the allotment basis (average production in the applicable base period) of any farm on which cotton was planted in any year after 1927 and before 1935 is 956 pounds or less, the allotment shall be 100 percent of the allotment basis; and if in prorating the county allotment the application of the necessary percentage figure to the allotment basis of any farm with an allotment basis of more than 956 pounds on which cotton was planted in any year after 1927 and before 1935 results in a figure of less than 956 pounds the allotment shall notwithstanding be 956 pounds."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 2, line 25, after the word "a" insert "bona fide."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Amend by striking out, on page 2, all language beginning with line 17 and ending with the words, "in excess of two bales", in line 22, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) Where during the crop year 1935-36 cotton is harvested on land with respect to which an allotment of tax-exempt cotton has been made, if the allotment made is less than 3 bales to each producer unit thereon, no tax shall be imposed under this act with respect to so much of the amount of cotton harvested from such land cultivated by said producer unit as is in excess of said allotment but not in excess of 3 bales: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to a producer unit where the acreage grown to cotton exceeds one-third the acreage grown to all crops."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER and Mr. McFARLANE) there were—ayes 24, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on my amendment that proposes to exempt 2-bale farms as recommended by the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask first if there are other perfecting amendments. [After a pause.] There seems to be none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KLEBERG: Page 2, strike out all of section 2, on pages 2 and 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER: Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Section 5 (a) of such act as amended is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, That no State shall receive an allotment for any crop year beginning with the year 1935-36 of less than 4,000 bales of cotton if during any one of the 10 crop years prior to the crop year 1935-36 the production of such State equaled 5,000 bales."

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I want to give every consideration in the world to those States which would be protected by this amendment.

Will the amendment affect the program in any way? I know a point of order would lie because we are not trying to amend section 5, but I do not want to make the point of order if by so doing it will work a grave injustice on any State.

Mr. KELLER. It would do a great injury to my district.

Mr. DOXEY. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Section 6 of such act, as amended (relating to allotments to producers), is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish, as soon as practicable, in each cotton-producing State, a board to be known as the 'Allotment Appeals Board', which shall consist of a representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary, and, with the consent of the State, a person designated by the attorney general of the State, and a person designated by the secretary of agriculture of the State.

"(2) Subject to such rules and regulations as the Allotment Appeals Board may prescribe relating to the time, place, and manner of hearing and disposing of appeals, any producer of cotton (including any share-cropper or tenant) who has been granted an allotment by, or whose application for an allotment has been denied by, the county committee, may appeal to such Appeals Board from the action of the county committee. The Appeals Board shall consider such appeal and, on the basis of the law and facts, shall affirm, modify, or set aside the action of the county committee. The decision of the Appeals Board shall be final and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make provisions for carrying out such final decisions.

"(3) The members of the Appeals Board shall be allowed compensation at the rate of \$10 per day while actually engaged in the work of the Board, except that the representative of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be paid such compensation as the Secretary may fix. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Appeals Board may appoint such clerical and stenographic assistants as may be necessary and may incur such expenses as may be necessary. An itemized statement of salaries and other expenses so incurred shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture at such times as he may require and shall, when allowed by him, be paid out of moneys available for administrative expenses under this act.

"(c) A list containing the name, address, and amount of the allotment of cotton to each producer in each county for the crop year 1935-36 shall be made public in such county."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 6, after the word "State", insert:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish such additional appeals boards as he finds necessary in any State and to fix the geographical jurisdiction of the respective boards in such State."

Page 4, line 22, strike out the word "provisions" and insert in lieu thereof the word "provision."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "and stenographic" and insert in lieu thereof "stenographic, and other."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendments to state my opposition to section 3. I have no desire to detain the Committee except to say that I understand some injustice and some inequalities were made by the county boards last year and that the object of this section of the bill is to remove them this year and to provide for an appeals board. I am in sympathy with this purpose, but inasmuch as the administration of this act is under the Secretary of Agriculture, if any material feature is taken out of the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and put into the hands of the State governments or

some agency of the State governments, we are likely to get more inefficient administration and more injustice than we had last year.

My understanding is that the inequalities of the act last year are being remedied by boards that are now being set up by the Secretary of Agriculture. If we adopt this amendment, instead of authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint the members of these boards and provide for the appointment of somebody who is recommended by the Attorney General of the State of Texas, and some person recommended by the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia or Texas, who may not be in sympathy with this act, we are hamstringing the administration of the act and we may get more injustices than we have had. I think it is doubtful if we can remedy these inequalities or remove politics by putting it into the hands of State administrations rather than leaving it in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture; and at the proper time I shall offer an amendment which has for its purpose the appointment of the members of these boards by the Secretary of Agriculture. He appoints all other officials charged with the administration of the control act, and I think that to charge him with a part of the administration of the act and leave the balance of the administration of the act to the attorneys general of the States affected is likely to cause more injustice and more inefficiency in the administration of the act, and more inequalities than we met with last year. I am just afraid that by putting a part of this administration in the hands of the officials of the State, taking it out of the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, we will be paving the way for more inefficiency.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Would it not be better if we had local field boards for each county?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My understanding is that the Department of Agriculture, in response to the gentleman's suggestion, has already provided for the election this year of the county committees, giving the farmer, share-croppers, and tenants the right to vote for them. The Department has also set up and is prepared to set up these appeal or adjustment boards. I favor the principle of this bill in this respect. If we take this matter out of the hands of the Agriculture Department and put it in the hands of the attorney general of the State or the secretary of agriculture who will appoint their political friends, we are likely to get more politics than we had last year. For this and other reasons, we should leave the administration of this matter to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. I may say the Secretary in the administration of this act stated to the committee that he was going to appoint the same people who, in the first instance, passed upon these things, and the farmer just as well not go anywhere to ask for an appeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand they are going to appoint men with qualifications similar to the qualifications the men had last year. For instance, if in Illinois they had a drought and flood, that board was restricted by rules and regulations adopted last year by the Department. Any board that is appointed will have to be governed by rules and regulations, and I respectfully submit that the Department of Agriculture, with the benefit of last year's experience, is better qualified than the attorney general in Illinois, or any other State, or even the secretaries of agriculture of the various States, because some of them are opposed to the act.

My thought is that we shall have adjustment or appeal boards, and the members ought to be familiar with this act. The Secretary of Agriculture, if he is responsible for the success of this act, ought to have the right to name these boards, and if does name them and restricts them by rules and regulations, he has the responsibility. If the bill is passed, the appointees of the attorney general and commissioner of agriculture could adopt rules that would nullify

the program, and we would thus wreck the act with a vengeance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I state that in the administration of the Bankhead control bill last year, it was largely through the extension service and the allotment board that farmers had the right of appeal, this board being composed of the same people and not a single person thereon being appointed by anyone else except the Secretary of Agriculture, they were unable to secure any results or get relief.

If there is any other way whereby we might be able to select a disinterested board to which farmers may appeal so as to be able to get rid of discriminations and the acts of the allotment committee, that would be perfectly satisfactory to me. Some of these allotment committees gave themselves and their relatives and friends large allotments at the expense of other farmers and the little farmer who had no chance to get a fair allotment. When the farmers appealed, they had to go to the same people who spoke the same language and who belong to the same organization, so to speak. Why should the secretary of agriculture of South Carolina or the attorney general of South Carolina appoint somebody that would want to wreck the whole program? The object is to appoint somebody to see to it that fair treatment is given to each one who files an appeal. If we have a disinterested board appointed by the secretary of agriculture and the attorney general in the State we may rest assured that the county allotment committees and those who have charge of the program will be fair because they will know that there is a board which complaints can be filed with that will uncover any errors as well as discrimination. I hope that the committee amendment will be agreed to, because it is one of the most important parts of the bill and will result in a square deal being given to the farmers down in the cotton South.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLELLAN to the committee amendment: In line 8, after the words "appeal boards", insert the following: "In the manner hereinabove provided."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the committee amendment is to amend the bill as originally drawn as to that part of it which provides for the establishment of additional appeal boards if the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary. The bill provides that one State appeal board shall be established. This merely says if any more are established by the Administrator—and I think they will be necessary, for I do not think one appeal board can possibly expedite all the work which will come before it without making arbitrary decisions—that all of the appeal boards which are set up by the Secretary of Agriculture should be established in the same manner.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there is any objection to the amendment. I may say to the gentleman that we discussed whether we would have representatives or additional appeal boards, and we expect them to be selected in the manner set out. That just clarifies the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment to the committee amendment as offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman. I reserve the right to object. I desire at least 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto

close in 15 minutes, and that speeches hereafter on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but I have an amendment to offer. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman expect to finish the bill this afternoon?

Mr. JONES. We certainly do.

Mr. MICHENER. How long does the gentleman expect to take to finish the bill?

Mr. JONES. We expect to finish in a little while. I do not think there is much of a controversial nature hereafter. There are just two more sections.

Mr. MICHENER. If this request is granted, will the gentleman close debate on all the rest of the bill very shortly?

Mr. JONES. Within a reasonable time. I will do my best and will make it just as short as I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object this is a very important bill. I know the committee has worked hard on it, but some of the rest of us think we have just as important ideas to express here as the gentlemen of the committee.

I do not want to object, but I cannot see that it matters if we take a couple of extra hours in order to consider the problem of the farmers of this country. If it is going to take until midnight to finish this bill, why not let us work on it and finish it? It is not necessary to pass it in the next 30 minutes, and unless those of us who have amendments to offer are recognized I shall object.

Mr. MICHENER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes, and that all remarks be limited to 3 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: On page 4, line 6, after the word "secretary" insert the words "or commissioner."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment. I think it is a proper one.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 3, line 34, strike out all of section 3, beginning with the words "the Secretary of Agriculture" in line 24, down to and including the word "act" in line 8, on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Where the producer and the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agents cannot agree upon the base acreage and/or production, the producer shall have the right of appeal to an arbitration committee of three producers within his county or parish, one member of which to be selected by the complaining producer, one member by the Secretary or his authorized agents, and the third member by the other two members. If the two members selected cannot agree upon the third member within 10 days from their appointment, the third member shall be appointed by the local official or official of such county or parish whose office has jurisdiction over county or parish finances. The arbitration committee shall provide for an open hearing within 10 days after completion of its membership, shall hear all material evidence offered, and shall decide the issue within 5 days after the hearings are completed. Members of said committee shall serve without charge to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The findings of the committee shall be final."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my colleagues for a moment, I am seeking to provide by this amendment for local arbitration in the county where the producer resides, 1 arbitrator to be appointed by the producer, 1 by the Secretary of Agriculture or his agent, and these 2 to select another, with certain provisions made for the selection of a third in the event they cannot agree. The entire procedure is to be had without any expense to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

If you set up an appeals board located at the State agricultural college, State capital, or elsewhere distant from most of the farmers of your State, it naturally follows that a great many of the farmers will never be able to present their appeals. They cannot go that distance and carry their witnesses with them and undertake to present their case to such an appeal board. No one or two or three appeals boards could possibly hear the thousands of appeals that would arise in any State. Last year, as I stated to the House, there would have been at least 10,000 appeals in my own State of Georgia.

I am seeking to provide a simplified procedure here without any expense to anybody, the Government or anybody else, by which a man's own neighbors within his county may hear the evidence in his case and arrive at a decision which shall be final.

It seems to me there can be no reasonable objection to this amendment. The other procedure you have provided for in this long section as now amended provides for stenographers and clerical help and the establishment, perhaps, at the State capital or elsewhere in the State of a number of boards the members of which shall get \$10 a day. The Lord only knows how much expenditure will be occasioned by this procedure. All that is certain is that the farmer will not get anything out of it except a letter, after about 60 days, in which they will tell him nothing can be done about his case. If you want to do anything for the farmer, if you want to give him an opportunity to have a review of the decision of the county committee by people who will hear the case on its merits, and give a decision in a reasonable time, let him have this arbitration procedure which, as I have said, is simple and inexpensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, the acceptance of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia covers practically the amendment I had intended to offer. So I shall not offer my amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the rates of tax on cotton harvested during the crop year 1935-36 shall be as follows:"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, sufficient has been read of the amendment offered to show that it is subject to a point of order for two reasons. In the first place, we have passed the section, and in the second place it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I admit, Mr. Chairman, that a point of order will lie against this amendment, but I certainly hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. The gentleman certainly will reserve his point of order.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The purpose of this proposed amendment is to provide for a graduated exemption tax. It proposes to insert a provision in the bill that would give the little fellow a break, so that the farmer growing under 6 bales would pay a small processing tax under the Bankhead bill. Those farmers raising over 6 but under 11 bales would pay a larger tax, and so on. Of those who write me their objections to the Bankhead bill, more complain about the injustice of the processing tax than any other provision of the law. There is no reason why a farmer growing 6 bales or less should pay the same processing tax as the one who produces 600 bales or more. Unless we do something along this line to relieve the small cotton farmer, we are going to have more corporation cotton growing in the

South, and more and more the little fellow will be squeezed out.

The Johnson amendment is as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the rates of tax on cotton harvested during the crop year 1935-1936 shall be as follows:

"(1) On the amount of cotton in excess of the allotment harvested on any farm the allotment to which is not more than six bales, 10 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 1 cent per pound;

"(2) On the amount of cotton in excess of the allotment harvested on any farm the allotment to which is more than 6 bales but less than 11 bales, 20 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 2 cents per pound;

"(3) On the amount of cotton in excess of 50 bales harvested on any farm, regardless of the amount of the allotment to such farm, 75 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 10 cents per pound; and

"(4) In all other cases the rate provided in subsection (a) shall apply."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out lines 34 and 35 on page 3, and lines 1 to 10 on page 4, and insert the following:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the language the amendment proposes to strike out has already been stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That language has been stricken out, and new matter has been inserted in lieu of that language.

Mr. McFARLANE. I make the point of order that the language is not germane to the point of the bill at which it is ordered.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Do I understand that section 3 down to and including line 10 has been stricken out?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment adopted was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and begins at line 24 on page 3 and goes through line 8 on page 5. The Chair sustains the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, then I offer this as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain an amendment of that character after action has been taken by the committee. A motion to strike out an amendment already adopted would have to come upon a request for a special vote in the House after the Committee goes back into the House. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk which was directed at a portion of the bill which has been stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may show my proposed amendment having been filed for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The proposed amendment of Mr. NICHOLS is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS: Page 4, line 1 insert before the word "cotton", "congressional district of each", and at line 4 after the first comma strike out all language down to and including the period in line 6, and insert, in lieu thereof, the following: "and a member selected by the Governor of said State, and a member selected by the agricultural division of the State government."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I have just received unanimous consent from the House to have incorporated in the RECORD an amendment which I had on the Clerk's desk, which amendment was directed at section 3 of the bill, wherein there was provided one appeal board for each State.

I realize, as does everyone else who has had any connection with and seen in operation the Bankhead Act in the past

year, that there is a great necessity for some method of appeal from the rulings of the local county committees; but I also am aware that a three-man board, acting for the whole State, could not, by any stretch of the imagination, adequately take care of the appeals that would come to them. Therefore, my amendment provided for the creation of a three-man appeal board in each congressional district of each of the cotton-producing States. Before the consideration of my amendment was reached, there was adopted an amendment to section 3 which provided for the creation of a local board of arbitration. I supported, of course, this amendment—not because I thought it was adequate, but because I figured we would be able to get nothing better, and by the adoption of that amendment, the amendment which I proposed will be held on a point of order as not being germane.

Thus, my reason for requesting unanimous consent to extend my remarks in explanation of why my amendment was never reached for consideration after it is shown by its inclusion in the RECORD that it was on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make a request when we get into the House that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: Amend subsection (a) of section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934, known as "Public, No. 169", by adding a new paragraph numbered paragraph 4 following paragraph 3 of said subsection (a) as follows:

"Upon determining the allotment to any farm, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider the class of the land as to productivity, and shall not permit discrimination in the amount of allotted cotton between similar producing lands in any locality or in any county."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have not the original act here so that I may show the pertinency of this amendment. This proposed amendment therefore might not appear pertinent without that, though I can explain it briefly in this way. The practical operation of the Bankhead Law down in our country is this. The appraisers will go out to a man's farm—and I shall give you a concrete illustration: I know of two instances in which there is only a turned row between two farms. The land is exactly alike. One farmer was allowed his claim on the basis of a lint production of 300 pounds to the acre and another man just a step from him, just a row, was allowed 150 pounds per acre. That means that one man gets \$3 per acre on the land that he leaves out of cultivation while the other man gets \$1.50. There is no difference at all in the productivity of the land or in its general farm value. They simply observe the land, and they just take a fellow's word for it. If one man will tell them that his land will produce 300 pounds of lint per acre, in the practical operation of this bill as it now is, they take his word for it, while if the other fellow tells them the truth about it and says that his land makes only 150 pounds of lint per acre, he gets \$1.50 in parity for having told the truth. This amendment simply provides that the land should be classified according to its productivity, and that the Secretary shall not permit discrimination in the amount of allotted cotton between similar producing lands in any locality or in any county.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is a proposal to amend section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934. Section 7 is not involved in this proposed bill. The amendment, therefore, is not germane.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I confess that I do not know so much about parliamentary rules and holdings, but last week, if the precedent is worth anything, under similar circumstances, in the amendment to the H. O. L. C., we had three acts under consideration, and every amendment we offered to those acts was held to be pertinent and

germane. This goes to the act that this amendment is seeking to correct.

Mr. DIES. In the case of those two farmers, did one have seniority over the other?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair will say that that bill was much broader in scope than the present bill. Section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934, is not touched in the pending bill, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would not be germane. The Chair is forced to sustain the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Amend on page 5, line 12, by adding a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 4. Section 7 (a) of such act is amended by inserting after subsection 3 thereof the following: 'or (4). A percentage of the sum of the average annual cotton production of the portion(s) of the farm operated as producer-unit(s) thereon, after giving 50 percent credit to the acreage and cotton production thereon and 50 percent credit to the acreage and cotton production of any other farm(s) or part(s) thereof previously owned, rented, share-cropped, or controlled by the same producer(s) for a fair representative period: *Provided*, Any increase in acreage of a producer-unit because of the application of this provision shall not be permissible as a base in excess of one-third of the cultivated area for the crop year for which tax-exemption certificates are applied.'"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. This section does not deal with allotments but with the method of appeal from allotments, and the section which makes allotments to individuals is not involved in this, except by way of appeal; not the actual schedules themselves.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I concede the point of order, although I regret that the gentleman from Texas is directing it. I feel that this subject matter ought to be dealt with in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 5, line 13, after the word "name", strike out the word "address."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 5, strike out all of lines 13 to 16, both inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 9 (d) of such act, as amended (relating to transfer of exemption certificates), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No rule or regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture shall prohibit the transfer or assignment by a cotton producer of certificates issued or reissued to him if such transfer or assignment is to another cotton producer who is a resident of the same State."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section conclude in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that I have I shall not attempt to discuss the provisions of this bill, but I wish to call attention to the Membership, and especially my colleagues from the South, that we may be treading on dangerous ground by continually attempting to pass legislation affecting cotton. In the last session of Congress we passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and this act provided a processing tax of 4.2 cents a pound upon all cotton processed. The imposition of this tax means that on

all carded yarns the manufacturer paid a tax equivalent to 5 cents a pound and that on all combed yarns practically 6 cents a pound was paid on account of the 4.2 cents on the cotton and the waste incurred in the manufacture.

Now, on cotton's chief competitor—rayon—there is no tax. Rayon is made from 70 percent wood pulp and 30 percent linters. The cost of the raw material is nothing like the cost of cotton. In 1920, 9,000,000 pounds of rayon was manufactured in the United States. In the year 1935, I am informed that something in excess of 225,000,000 pounds were manufactured. Two hundred and twenty-five million pounds of rayon fiber is equivalent to nearly 700,000 bales of staple cotton. The world production of rayon last year was approximately the equivalent of 1,200,000 bales of cotton. In the United States alone a great many articles that used to be made out of cotton, such as paper tape, towels, paper bags, and many other articles formerly used that were made out of cotton, were made out of substitutes; and the entire amount of all these manufactured articles and cloths used the equivalent of over 2,000,000 bales of cotton.

In the last few years you have noticed, no doubt, that in many instances wearing apparel made out of rayon can be purchased cheaper than the same class of goods made out of cotton in the stores. I call this to your attention, and especially you gentlemen from the South, that because of the competition caused from the substitute for cotton we are fast losing our internal trade on cotton goods, and on account also of the attempted artificial raising of the price of cotton by different pieces of legislation we are in serious danger of losing our export trade in cotton.

The cotton textile manufacturing industry of the Nation is being hurt by the levy of the processing tax, and when the manufacturers are hurt the farmers are likewise hurt; and the cotton farmers of the South will continue to be hurt, both by the domestic use of cotton as well as the loss of export trade. I voted for the Bankhead bill as an emergency measure. I am voting for this legislation today as an emergency measure. But I think, and I am exceedingly serious about it, that those of us from the cotton States, sooner or later, had better get together in order that we can formulate legislation which in the end will not prove detrimental to the cotton farmers of the South.

Whenever the price of cotton gets beyond a certain level, then you will find that cotton will be produced at a small profit in many of the foreign countries in competition with the American cotton.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Certainly.

Mr. ANDRESEN. It was my understanding that the old law provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could levy a processing tax upon substitutes. Has he done that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Secretary of Agriculture has not levied a processing tax on substitutes because, while a great many of us felt and knew that the increased cost of goods caused by the processing tax aided in the substitution of rayon, yet the law provided that unless the shift towards a competing substance, such as rayon, was caused by the levying of the processing tax that it could not be placed upon the substitute. Rayon manufactured into goods is very pretty and has a nice texture. A great many people may use it on account of its looks. The compensating tax would not have anything to do with this, but I feel that the time is coming when, of necessity, not alone for the cotton-textile industry of this Nation but for the farmers themselves, that the processing tax should be removed. The law should be repealed which provides it. If this is done, it will have a tendency to increase the use of cotton in America. The question is, especially with those of us from the South, whether we want to increase the domestic consumption of cotton goods.

Mr. HOLMES. I am in hopes that the cotton manufacturers of Massachusetts will give their cotton the same sheen you are speaking of with respect to rayon.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I agree with the gentleman; only I will go further and hope and trust that the cotton-textile manufacturers of the United States by their efforts will be able in the future to produce cotton goods which in every way will be as pretty as rayon.

In conclusion, let me say to you of the South that the time is now at hand, and not only the southern Members of Congress but the southern Governors and commissioners of agriculture in the various States, when we should formulate plans for the production of cotton in the Southern States, in order that we may retain our domestic market and gain back our foreign trade.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TARVER: Amend, on page 5, end of section 4, by striking the quotation marks and adding the following: "There shall not be issued to any producer tax-exemption certificates in excess of those necessary to gin tax free the cotton grown by such producer during the year for which tax-exemption certificates are applied; unless such producer, as the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agent(s) finds, has suffered a reduction from normal cotton production during the year for which tax-exemption certificates have been applied by reason of drought, storm, flood, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural cause."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. One of the most frequent objections to the enforcement of the Bankhead Act comes from farmers who have not received enough certificates of exemption to market their cotton and who have near them neighbors who have received more certificates than they need, and who, after having marketed all of their own crop, proceed to sell their excess of certificates to their less fortunate neighbors.

This amendment simply provides that no man shall have an allotment of cotton-exemption certificates beyond what is necessary to market tax free his own crop.

It seems to me the committee should agree to accept this amendment. There is no reason founded in justice why some favored farmer should be in the receipt of certificates far beyond his needs during a normal season when he produced all the cotton he would have normally produced and his neighbors, because of having been less fortunate in their allotments from the county committee, not be allowed to market all of their cotton without the payment of taxes or the purchase of certificates.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I regret I shall be compelled to insist on the point of order. This particular section applies only to the transfer and assignment of certificates, whereas the amendment refers to the issuance to the producer, which is an entirely different matter, and which is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the line of demarcation between what is in order according to the opinion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] and what is not in order is rather finely drawn, and that it necessarily follows from a reading of the section of the bill to which the amendment I have offered has been proposed, section 4, that anything relating to the issuance of these tax-exempt certificates or to their transfer, or seeking to restrict their transfer, will necessarily be within the purview of the section and in order.

I cannot undertake to discuss the matter at length, because it had not occurred to me that any gentleman would raise a point of order of this character, and I have not studied the parliamentary question involved. It is impossible, however, for me to see how the point of order can be successfully invoked.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the section purports to deal with section 9 (d) of the act relating to the transfer of exemption certificates, and inasmuch as the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia does not refer to the subject, in the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well founded.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. Section 17 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to pay any person who, in connection with the operation of any cotton gin, incurred additional expense in connection

with the administration of this act with respect to cotton harvested and ginned during the crop year 1935-36, and who applies to the Secretary therefor, compensation at the rate of 25 cents per bale of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion) of such cotton ginned by such person. No payment shall be made under this subsection with respect to cotton ginned after the effective date of any code, license, or marketing agreement entered into or issued under the National Industrial Recovery Act, as amended, or the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, if under such code, license, or agreement any part of the charges for ginning or other services performed by the ginner includes any expense incurred by the ginner in connection with the administration of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, beginning in line 11, strike out "of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEBERG: Page 6, line 9, after the word "during", insert the words "the crop year 1934-35 and";

On line 11, after the word "compensation", insert the following: "at the rate of 35 cents per bale for the year 1934-35 and for the year 1935-36."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment.

The bill under consideration simply covers 1 year, the crop year of 1935-36, and provides for the payment, or refunding, of some expense to the ginner for this year. This amendment is an attempt to add another year, a different year, and the payment of expense for that additional year. That portion of the amendment which undertakes to increase the rate for this year would be germane, but undertaking to include a previous year, an entirely different transaction, or different year which has already passed, is not germane because this bill covers just 1 year. If there were 2 years, a third could be added, but where there is just 1 year, a second cannot be added.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment for the inclusion of last year could very properly follow this part of the bill.

This year's requirement, of course, will be lower and I cannot see why the inclusion of an additional year would not be just as germane as the inclusion of the following year.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, this bill deals simply with the crop year 1935-36 and the Chair thinks that an amendment relating to a preceding crop year would not be germane to the pending bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that under this limitation all speeches be limited to 3 minutes, with the exception of that of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 6, line 1, strike out all of section 5.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to consume the entire 5 minutes, unless perhaps some members of the committee desire to ask questions with reference to this particular section.

I made some remarks earlier in the day in general debate with reference to this particular section, no. 5, which my amendment seeks to take out of the bill. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that under the exist-

ing law the ginner of cotton are required to make certain reports to the Treasury and are required to render certain services with reference to the collection of the tax. They now seek by this amendment to have the United States Government pay them for the service they render to the farmers, because after all no one can claim that the service they render in collecting this tax is a service to the Government. The Treasury of the United States certainly does not benefit as the result of the Bankhead Act. We are using the taxing power of the Government to assist the farmers in getting a better price for their cotton and to control production. There is no question but what the service rendered by the ginner in the collection of this tax is a service they render to the farmers and it should be a proper charge to that industry.

Mr. Chairman, under this amendment the United States Treasury would be forced to pay out about two and a half million dollars to the ginner. May I say that in my opinion it would be legalized graft, racketeering. They should be willing to perform this service for the farmer. During all of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture on all of these bills we have processors coming in and saying, "Why, our interests are tied up with the farmers'. We have a mutuality of interest." We always hear them say that their interests are tied up with those of the farmer, that they are trying to help each other, but during the consideration of this bill is the first time I heard a processor come up and admit that maybe his interest was not quite as mutual with the farmer as other processors had attempted to make us believe. This is a service for the farmer. There is no justification for the United States Treasury paying two and a half million dollars to the ginner for performing this service.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment should be adopted, and the section stricken from the bill.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that in connection with last year's crop they only collected \$90,000 in taxes for which they wanted \$5,000,000 compensation?

Mr. BOILEAU. There is no question about that, and if their proposition had been in effect last year the Bankhead bill would have brought in \$90,000 and we would have paid out \$5,000,000 for collection purposes.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Assuming there were some revenues collected and the work which was performed was on behalf of the Government of the United States, would there be any difference in the work that these ginner do as compared with the work that many others do who pay Federal taxes, such as keeping their books and records and transmitting their reports to the United States Government?

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true. You might just as well say that a man who pays an income tax to the Government should be paid for making out his tax return.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KVALE. Will the next step be to give a payment to the elevator men, to the millers, and to the other processors in the case of other commodities?

Mr. BOILEAU. There is no question about that. If we make this provision applicable to the ginner we will have to go ahead and pay all of those people who collect the processing taxes, the packers, and the rest of them.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Under the A. A. A., the Treasury Department is reimbursed out of the A. A. A. collections for the operations of collecting?

Mr. BOILEAU. That is part of this money.

Mr. TABER. This goes out of the Treasury?

Mr. BOILEAU. In a sense—it is out of appropriations made for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. If

you give the ginner two and a half million dollars, it means two and a half million dollars less money available to help the farmers.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that this is not a direct appropriation coming out of the Treasury, but is a fund set aside for this particular purpose, and when they say only \$90,000 was collected, they do not take into consideration the certificates which were sold at 4 cents a pound, and many of which are now outstanding.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman does not want to give the impression that the United States benefits from the sale of these pool tickets?

Mr. DOXEY. The pool tickets go to pay the administrative expenses.

Mr. BOILEAU. Those men who sell their certificates in a pool are paid directly and that does not go into the Treasury. They put their tickets in a pool and they are paid back, so there is no benefit to the Government as a result of the operation of such a pool. The only money this Bankhead Act brought in was \$90,000.

Mr. DOXEY. And they have 700,000 bales which they have not sold.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of clarity I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is an analogy between the service offered by the packing plants in Chicago and the milling establishments in Minneapolis and that which is rendered by the ginner in the South; and if this is true, then, in all logic and reason, the packers and the millers as processors, would be fully justified in rendering a bill of particulars to the Government of the United States and asking for a similar hand-out, if that is what it is.

Mr. JONES. I think the analogy does not run complete at all, for the reason that the processing fee is a fee due by the packers themselves. The ginning tax involves a good deal more than the processing tax. The ginning tax involves the collection of a tax. It involves separate provisions they must make for the different kind of tags and a reporting system. It is the collection of a tax for the farmer and I think it goes much beyond the processing tax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yet it is substantially the same kind of service which would justify them in submitting a bill.

Mr. JONES. Except the ginning tax involves a much greater expense because they have so many more details.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the processors under the Kerr tobacco bill?

Mr. JONES. Well, we have not had that. The collections under the Bankhead bill will be far more than sufficient to cover any amount that will be paid out in this tax. There are 400,000 of these certificates yet undisposed of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it is money that comes out of Uncle Sam's Treasury and is handed over to individuals.

Mr. JONES. No; all administrative expenses are paid out of the collections under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the ultimate consumer has to pay for the benefit that is rendered to an individual.

Mr. JONES. That is a different story altogether.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it involves the same principle.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, if the gentleman will permit, whether it is a fact that last year there was only collected \$90,000 under the Bankhead Act?

Mr. JONES. Ninety-two thousand up to a certain time, but there are 400,000 certificates yet outstanding, and the gentleman understands that a lot of that cotton was taken back.

Mr. BOILEAU. But the cotton is practically all ginned.

Mr. JONES. But last year was the year of the great drought, and the production was much below the Bankhead allotment.

Mr. BOILEAU. The production was not materially below the allotment.

Mr. JONES. About six or seven hundred thousand bales.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is not a great deal.

Mr. JONES. That is a good deal of cotton.

Mr. BOILEAU. It is not sufficient to bring in enough money to take care of these additional taxes?

Mr. JONES. I think normally we will collect probably several million dollars through these Bankhead taxes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Not if the bill is successful.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] and to call attention to the fact that his argument apparently is based on a theory that does not fit the picture at all. He is talking about the ginners wanting to charge \$5,000,000 for having collected \$90,000 in taxes. I call his attention to the combination between the plow-up campaign and the operations of the Bankhead Act, where, with the nearly 10,000,000 bales we have now, each bale is worth more than twice as much as they were prior to the plow up and the operation of the Bankhead Act, as a result of the service the ginner did, not only for the farmer, as the gentleman put it, but for this Government.

I call my friend's attention to the fact that the service he speaks of, and bemoans as a paltry service in the collection of \$90,000, increases the earning capacity of real property in the entire South.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. This is the foundation of the credit structure. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman wants to be fair. He has misstated my position.

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot yield. I asked the gentleman to yield to me and he did not yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true.

Mr. KLEBERG. I also want to call attention to the fact that the real service done for the farmer by the ginners was not the collection of the tax, but was far and above anything the gentleman knows about, and they did this at their own expense. The average ginner in my district paid at least 90 cents per bale for the privilege of serving the farmer.

Does the gentleman believe it is fair for one group of American citizens to be put out of pocket by a law passed by Congress and the administration?

Mr. BOILEAU. I mean to say that the bill would not be self-supporting. The Treasury of the United States is not benefited by the administration of the Bankhead Act.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the gentleman think that they should be out this money for the service for nothing?

Mr. BOILEAU. No. I say that is a part of the cost of doing business, and they could pass it on to the producer just as they do for labor and machinery.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did the gentleman ever see an agent of the Government work for nothing?

Mr. BOILEAU. Anybody who makes up a tax report is doing something.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did the gentleman ever hear of a tax collector being paid a salary?

Mr. BOILEAU. They do not collect the taxes in the true sense. The United States is not benefited by it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were—ayes 37, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 1 for the purpose of making a correction. In striking out the paragraph the necessary preliminary declaration was stricken out, and I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out all of line 15 and insert:

"Section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of inter-

state and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved April 21, 1934, is."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the subsequent section numbers be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk is authorized to correct the section numbers.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On page 6, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to mail exemptions certificates to applicants by registered mail."

The CHAIRMAN. All time upon this section has expired.

Mr. JONES. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to reserve his point of order?

Mr. JONES. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that he be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to require the Secretary of Agriculture to send the exemption certificates to the farmer by registered mail rather than to force the farmer to go 10 or 15 miles or farther to the county agent's office. Under the present rules the cotton producer must travel to the county seat, call on the county agent, and lose a better part of a day to make an application for his exemption certificate; then go back to the same place and stand in line for 3 hours or 3 days, as the case may be, to get his exemption certificate.

It is said that it will cost some money to send these exemption certificates by registered mail. The cost will only be 10 or 12 cents. Surely this great Government of ours can afford to spend 10 or 12 cents rather than the cotton farmer can afford to spend a day and probably a dollar or a dollar and half or \$2 to go to town to get his exemption certificate. This is one of the weaknesses of the Bankhead Act. It is absurd to require the farmer to go to town to the county agent's office and stand in line to get his exemption certificate. I hope the Chairman will not press his point of order against this amendment, but will permit the Committee to vote on its merits. Since the Department has thus far refused to do anything to correct this obnoxious practice Congress ought to do so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is an administrative matter. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the amendment is not germane in view of the fact that it provides for the mailing of the exemption certificate, which has nothing to do with the bill under consideration. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6424, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the

amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions that the committee report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 1, strike out all of section 5.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. BOILEAU, there were—ayes 41, noes 106.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOW THE FEDERAL LAND BANK AT ST. PAUL OPERATES WITH FARMERS OF THE NORTHWEST AND HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM CANNOT RELIEVE THE FARMERS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker:

FEDERAL LAND BANK, ST. PAUL, ESTABLISHED IN 1920

PRESENT OFFICERS

Roy A. Nelson, president. Republican. South Dakota banker formerly connected with Northwest National Bank of Minneapolis, member Northwest Bank Corporation, former receiver Southern Minneapolis Joint Stock Land Bank.

Frank G. Wanek, vice president and secretary. Republican; Hoover appointee. Secretary from 1928 to 1933. Now vice president. Chain banker.

G. S. Gordhamer, vice president and treasurer. Banker; Republican. Chain banker.

F. H. Klawon, was director and president from 1928 to 1934, but on the demands of thousands of complaints coming from North Dakota, Klawon was removed as president, and Roy A. Nelson took his place. Klawon was a banker connected with the Minneapolis and St. Paul chain-bank ring. A Republican.

Being requested to resign, we lost sight of Klawon for about 24 hours. When the smoke of complaint cleared, we find him complacently sitting behind the desk of the president of the intermediate credit bank, just across the street, where he still remains, entrenched through the power of the Twin City chain-bank ring.

There were, of course, other directors, but they were scattered around the country. All bankers and all Republicans, but who were not actively engaged in the business.

The complaints against the bank still come in and the main complaint is that, no matter what the interest rate is, even if it were as low as the rate in the Frazier-Lemke bill,

still the Federal land bank would not serve the farmers generally. It is manned by too many bankers, and by those whose reactionary tendencies renders them quite incapable of rendering a service that is imperative and necessary.

I have not made an investigation of the countless army of field men, attorneys, and appraisers, but this I do know that a great many of these men are "busted bankers" of the Northwest.

In the period from May 1, 1933, to December 31, 1934, the number of farm-loan applications from North Dakota alone to this bank was 41,759. Of this number only 13,377 land-bank loans were made, or 32 percent.

Seventeen thousand two hundred and sixty loans were converted into commissioners' loans, which required chattel security and crop security. Eleven thousand one hundred and twenty-two farmers from North Dakota were turned away, not receiving any help from either the bank or the commissioner.

In addition to this it must be remembered that of the loans actually made, all on an average were reduced 26 percent. In other words, of the original land-loan applications made by farmers only 74 percent of them were not reduced, and of this 74 percent considered only 32 percent were made by the bank. This leaves the percentage of loans made on the original applications only 26.88 percent.

In all, only \$73,567,000 was loaned in North Dakota by both the Federal land bank and the commissioners. The farm indebtedness on land in North Dakota is three hundred million, nearly, if not all, of which is due. There is still needed two hundred and twenty-seven million to take up the debt. It cannot be had, and that is the reason why we have had to resort to Holiday Association activity and secure State-wide moratoriums against foreclosures.

The financing of farms under the present Federal land-bank plan means in North Dakota, if all loans were made by the bank, an annual interest charge of \$18,000,000. Under the Frazier-Lemke plan the annual interest charge would be on \$4,500,000 and principal payments of \$4,500,000, or a saving of \$9,000,000 per year, and with the further security that as the annual payments were made, the whole debt would be wiped out at the end of the loan period. In 47 years—the loan period under the Frazier-Lemke bill—the farmers would make a saving of \$423,000,000, and besides, the debt would be fully paid at the end of the period. Under the Federal land-bank plan in 47 years the farmers in North Dakota would have paid in interest alone \$846,000,000, and they would still owe the debt of \$300,000,000 besides.

The net difference would be, for North Dakota alone, \$723,000,000, or nearly two and one-half times the amount of the present indebtedness.

Could the farmers of North Dakota buy anything with this seven hundred and twenty-three million? Would they become customers again in the trade channels? Would they buy manufactured products from the East and South? Would men who have no work find work?

Let each Congressman apply these figures to his own State and thus determine what can be done by a change in our system of farm loans.

In the meantime, how would the Government fare? The Treasury bills issued to finance the Frazier-Lemke plan would not draw interest. The Government would be out just the cost of printing. Today the Federal Reserve notes are issued in the same manner. Nearly \$4,000,000,000 of them in circulation. When the Government wants money, bonds are issued, and then sold to the financial system at 3½-percent interest. Sometimes more. The Government loses this interest and private interests gain that amount. If the Government issued currency to finance the farm indebtedness of \$9,000,000,000, they would save under this system \$315,000,000 annually. In 47 years the Government would save \$14,705,000,000, or enough to pay one-half of the World War debt.

The Government would be the winner, the farm homes would be saved and the unequal distribution of wealth in the Nation would be on the way to adjustment. This unequal distribution of wealth never would have taken place

if we had, as voters, determined that this Government should control its finances and not turn that important function over to private interests.

The complaint lodged against many of the men who have been connected with these Government institutions and referred to as Republicans is not to say that no Republican should be connected with the institutions, but when I have used the word Republican, I mean reactionary Republican. By reactionary I mean one who is satisfied with and connected with a business system that can see nothing but profits and business gain; one who believes that all new measures intended to bring back to the people a greater share of the Government, is visionary, disquieting to business—their profit business—and that the sponsors of these new measures are demagogues and reds. Any one who intimates the curtailment of private profits is looked upon as an enemy of the country. These reactionaries have been in possession of the machinery of Government so long that they are actually beginning to believe they own the Government.

It is men of this type that have been intrusted with the responsibility of handling these Government agencies concerned with advancing credits to the people of the Northwest. If the Democratic Party is the party of progress, the party which hopes to restore the Government to the people, it can make no faster headway than to remove every reactionary in control of these finance institutions. The Democrats could not do a worse job, and besides, there are some progressive Democrats who are capable of handling important business. Why does not the Democratic administration clean house in the Twin Cities? Can it be that these wily, reactionary Coolidge-Hoover Republican appointees have been wise enough to make liberal contributions to the Democratic Party? I do not know that they have, but I do know they would if they thought that meant leaving them in the Government cream pan. It may be due to the fact that between these men in control in the Twin Cities and the higher-ups here at Washington there is a community of interest arising from the profession (financial brotherhood), that is stronger than any political party. Whatever the reason they are still doing business at the old stand.

Do these reactionaries turn down applications of farmers because they are what they are pleased to call "radical"? The answer is absolutely "yes." I have had filed with me during the past year complaint after complaint where the failure of a loan was due to the fact of the applicant's political belief. The whole finance administration in the Northwest is out of sympathy with the people. The directors, officers, appraisers, and every last employee is known to be "conservative." They make conservative loans. I have never yet met any director, officer, appraiser, attorney, or other employee of this whole Federal land bank set-up, outside of the Federal Land Bank Commissioner, who can stomach the word "progressive", yet the great majority of the people with which this organization deals is overwhelmingly progressive. The farmers know their friends and sympathizers are not in control.

I have many complaints here which show that the farmer was turned down because he was a nonpartisan. I have complaints here that Communists because they were Communists have been turned down. I have complaints here that because farmers were radical and did not mind their own business, caused a rejection of their applications.

Reactionary treatment of that kind only makes the matter worse. I think it perfectly fair to make this statement, that the reactionaries in America are doing more to build up the ranks of the Soviet than all the Communist organizers in America. The American farmer is not naturally a Communist; he is an individual and believes in individual property and individual expression, but I want to also add that the reactionaries are doing the best they know how to drive him into communism. A half-starved man with underfed children, with starving livestock in the sight of Government feed, knowing that the administrators of relief are against him, a man who has been turned down in his loan and sees the sheriff coming for a foreclosure sale, will embrace any

belief which promises any measure of protection. Reactionary business men do not know this principle of human nature. They have never known it. In the history of the world, men of this type have always refused to see the evidence before them, and the future of the country which protects them concerns them not. Their patriotism is one of more profits, more gain, more money, and let the common people be damned.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL. H. R. 2066—
S. 212

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending on your desk House Resolution 123 by Mr. WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, which provides for the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of H. R. 2066 commonly known as the "Frazier-Lemke bill", the farmers' farm-relief act. This is a bill to liquidate and re-finance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system, through the use of the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Reserve banking system, and creating a board of agriculture to supervise the same.

This measure and similar measures have been widely discussed for the past several years throughout the Nation. There are now on file before this Congress concurrent resolutions enacted by the house and senate of 29 State legislatures memorializing Congress to speedily enact this legislation into law, as follows: Montana, Nevada, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, California, Nebraska, Oregon, Indiana, Arizona, Idaho, Colorado, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Iowa, South Carolina, Kansas, Michigan, Ohio, Texas, Kentucky, Wyoming, North Carolina, Arkansas, New Mexico, New Jersey, and Washington.

The lower houses of the following State legislatures have memorialized Congress to enact this law: New York, Delaware, Alabama, and Missouri.

In addition, the following Governors have sent telegrams, within the last 10 days, urging their representatives in Congress and the Committee on Agriculture to have the bill reported out for discussion and passage on the floor: Governor La Follette, Wisconsin; Governor Floyd Olson, Minnesota; Governor Berry, South Dakota; and the Governor and Legislature of Michigan sent a special delegation to Washington last week to urge their representatives to sign the petition to bring the Frazier-Lemke bill out on the floor for discussion on its merits and passage.

Mr. J. Edward Anderson, State secretary, Minnesota Farmers Union, has received the following telegram from Governor Olson, of St. Paul, Minn., showing his attitude and the attitude and the sentiment in Minnesota regarding this legislation:

ST. PAUL, MINN., March 14, 1935.

J. EDWARD ANDERSON,

State Secretary Minnesota Farmers' Union, Harrington Hotel.

The people of Minnesota are solidly behind the Frazier-Lemke bill. Nineteen thirty-three legislature passed concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress to enact bill. This bill represents the only legislation now proposed before Congress which will assist Minnesota farmers in retaining their homes.

FLOYD B. OLSON, Governor.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned today by one of our colleagues "Some of them (memorials) are about as foolish as I have ever seen written on paper. If we are going to continue to put them into the body of the RECORD, we will not have any place for the proceedings of the House."

It seems that the above-quoted memorials by a large majority of the States throughout the Nation urging Congress to enact this legislation is beginning to worry some of the Members of Congress. At this time 124 Members of the House have signed the above resolution to discharge the Agriculture Committee from further consideration of the bill and to bring this legislation before Congress for a vote.

An effort was made in the last session of Congress to force a vote upon this question and through a maneuver in par-

liamentary procedure such a vote was avoided by the leaders of the House. The farmers of the Nation are demanding this legislation and the sooner this legislation is brought before the House the better pleased the farmers and their friends will feel about this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—COTTON CONTROL

Mr. WHELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in the subject that we now have under discussion; that is, a bill introduced by Mr. DOXEY, a member of the Agriculture Committee, to amend the Bankhead law.

On January 23, 1935, I introduced a bill, it being H. R. 4882. I did not feel that the small farmers were getting a square deal, by reason of the operation of the Bankhead bill, and, as a result of this, I was actuated to introduce the bill that I have just mentioned. The provisions of my measure were to the effect that a small farmer be exempted 2 bales of cotton, and in addition thereto, one-half bale for each dependent of his family, exclusive of himself and wife, and also to pay a reasonable compensation for the ginner, who had been occasioned so much work and worry, by reason of collecting the imposed taxes.

Now, as I understand, this bill, it being H. R. 6424, provides for an exemption of 3 bales to each farmer and 25 cents per bale for the ginner, and also an appeal board is provided in this bill, H. R. 6424.

If I understand correctly, it is the purpose of this measure to exempt 3 bales to each farmer. My information is that the Department of Agriculture insists that an exemption of 2 bales shall be given to only land-owning farmers, which would exclude tenants and croppers.

These provisions of the Department, making the allowance thus, would work a hardship more than ever on the small farmers. Since H. R. 6424, as I understand proposes to make the exemption to every farmer, this to include land-owning, cropper, or tenant farmer, and rather than take a chance of getting the whole measure defeated, and it be in force, as of last year, I am not insisting that my bill be made a substitute for the one now under consideration.

While this measure does not do justice to the small farmers, in my opinion, it is much better than the previous provision, and will make the burden of the small farmer, to some extent, lighter.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this legislation, as amended, in the hope that it will render a greater measure of justice and benefit to the small cotton farmers of the South and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we can have no permanent business prosperity unless it is based on agriculture, and it is essential that our cotton, tobacco, grain, and dairy farmers be recognized and treated in all our legislation on a parity with industry.

I desire to quote a brief statement from Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange, contained in his address delivered before the National Grange annual session at Hartford, Conn., on November 14, 1934:

In May of 1933 the industrial price level stood at 101 and the agricultural prices at 62 of pre-war, giving a spread of 39 points to the disadvantage of agriculture. There has been definite improvement during recent months, and the October price index of the Department of Agriculture shows that farm prices have risen to 102 of pre-war (1909-14), while industrial prices have climbed rapidly and stand at 126. Thus, farm-purchasing power is still retarded and the farm dollar stands at but 81 cents. Restored farm-purchasing power still remains an essential step to national recovery as well as to rural welfare. Every constructive step that the administration, Congress, organized agriculture, and farmers themselves can take should be directed toward bringing the farm dollar to par, not only for the good of agriculture but of the Nation itself. It is true that in some sections we find certain commodities that have now reached their pre-war level. Other commodities, like dairying and some types of vegetable growing and general farming, are in less satisfactory condition than a few years ago. On the whole, the agricultural picture is encouraging. Farm conditions have improved during the last year. The farmer can look toward 1935 with more assurance than in any year in a decade. While the fight for equality and price parity is far from won, agriculture's leadership must not be modest in demanding their own rights, because we cannot benefit the farmer without benefiting those in every walk of life.

THE EMERGENCY PROGRAM

This Congress and administration received a mandate from the people to seek a solution of the farm problems, and the heroic

and unusual steps taken were made necessary by the seriousness of the farm situation. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was the method selected to fulfill the pledges to the public. While emergency and experimental in its character, automatically passing out whenever the President declares the emergency is passed, service has been rendered to many commodities in distress. Acreage restriction has been of value to many crops, and benefit payments have had a tendency to restore farm purchasing power. As a result of the drought, acreage restrictions are not now so seriously needed, but guidance and balance will be essential to ease agriculture through their period of readjustment. With practically all of our burdensome surpluses under control, with an actual shortage in seed and forage, little reduction is required for 1935, and we can hope for gradual elimination of restrictive measures.

OUR LONG-TERM PROGRAM

President Roosevelt and his administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the A. A. A., are to be commended for the thoughtful efforts being made to develop a long-time agricultural program that can meet the changing conditions confronting our farm life.

Mr. Speaker, we have made substantial progress in our efforts to rehabilitate agriculture, as evidenced by increased prices of all farm products, but our goal will not have been attained until the farmer receives a reasonable profit above the cost of production.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this bill, which was introduced by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, WALL DOXEY. It will be recalled by members of the Agricultural Committee and other interested parties that early in the session I introduced a similar bill. The only substantial difference between my bill and the one now under consideration is that the bill of my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOXEY] provides for a 2-bale exemption to the small cotton farmers of the South and mine provided for a 5-bale exemption. Inasmuch as Mr. DOXEY is the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, it was only appropriate that the committee should have reported out his bill. Moreover, Mr. DOXEY has given much thought to this problem and is certainly one of the ablest members of that distinguished committee.

However, my colleague from Arkansas, who is also very much concerned about this matter, has offered his amendment to Mr. DOXEY's bill, which would increase the exemption from the processing tax from 2 bales to 3 bales. At the time Mr. MILLER obtained recognition from the Chair to offer his amendment I was on my feet seeking recognition so that I might offer my amendment to increase it to 5 bales. Nevertheless, I shall support my colleague's amendment to Mr. DOXEY's bill, with the hope that it would have a better opportunity of passing and thereby secure a 3-bale exemption from this tax rather than to run the risk of muddying the waters by my amendment and possibly not getting more than a 2-bale exemption.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration officials do not look with favor upon any exemption measure. It is said that they claim that we will disrupt the whole Bankhead control program if we grant these exemptions to the small farmer. Frankly, I would vote for this exemption to our small farmers from this tax if I knew that it would disrupt the whole control program. But I do not believe that it will have any such effect. The truth is that while it appeared last year that something had to be done in order to save the cotton farmer of the South and that the Bankhead Cotton Control Act was enacted into law for that purpose, and while it is true that we were in a great economic disturbance and a national emergency, yet I doubt seriously that any such program as this is economically sound. And I would not be a party to it as a permanent institution. Moreover, I doubt seriously that if I had an opportunity now to vote on the question of continuing the act for another year that I would vote for it. At the best it is a makeshift proposition. We must realize sooner or later that the law of supply and demand is as immutable as the stars in the heavens. In this time of great economic depression, I am wondering if we have not been doing many things that were an attempt to hold in abeyance, if not repeal, this law. The only justification that can be made of that type of legislation is that it was justified by the great national emergency.

If the Members of the House could have witnessed first hand what I witnessed down in the cotton-growing section of the South, there would be no doubt about the passage of this amendment to the control act. They would have seen, not in one isolated instance, but in thousands of instances, some poor farmer coming to the gin with his 2 or 3 bales of cotton to be ginned. These 2 or 3 bales of cotton represented his entire wealth for that year. Upon his ability to sell it depended his ability to pay the supply merchant for the supplies advanced and his ability to feed, clothe, and educate his children for the coming winter. Then only to be confronted at the gin with the proposition that under the allotment of that particular county that they were entitled to only gin possibly 200 pounds, or maybe a bale, without paying the exorbitant processing tax upon the balance. If this tax were paid, of course the farmer would not break even. Yet many of them in their desperation paid the tax and their families suffered the consequences.

It is very obvious that the danger of losing our foreign market is great if any control of our domestic production is continued. Other parts of the world have learned that they too can grow cotton. Not only can they grow cotton, but in many instances they can grow it cheaper than we can here. It is obvious to one who stops to think that if we continue to curb our production in this country those countries of the world who can grow cotton will speed up their production in order to take advantage of the increased price and the scarcity of cotton on the market. I am very apprehensive that if this control policy continues we will lose the world market. In furtherance of this thought it is a significant fact that while we were reducing our production of cotton under the Bankhead Act last year, there was a sharp increase in the production in other countries. For instance, India increased her production 8 percent, Egypt increased her production 22 percent, and Brazil increased her production 68 percent.

It is therefore quite evident that this question of the world market is in no sense a light matter. It requires and demands our most thoughtful consideration. I cannot see how we can continue this control policy and at the same time keep our world market.

What I should like to see done would be to peg the prices of the cotton to be consumed in this country at a definite figure, say, 12 cents. Then say to the farmers of the country that they can raise all the additional cotton over the domestic market that they see fit and take a chance on the world market for what they may get for it. Mr. Speaker, I have under consideration just such legislation, which I hope to discuss at a future date.

And in conclusion may I say to my colleagues who reside north of the Mason and Dixon's line that this cotton problem is primarily our problem in the South just as other questions are peculiarly our questions in the South. The great majority of the southern Representatives in this House are in favor of this exemption, and I appeal to you to go along with us in this and let us have this exemption and thereby help the poor southern farmer to this extent at least.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my conclusions with reference to H. R. 6424, which is a bill introduced by Mr. DOXEY, of Mississippi, and which provides for certain amendments to the Bankhead bill. I represent 25 agricultural counties, most of which are devoted to cotton production.

Now, a section of the Doxey bill, as amended, provides that cotton farmers who have a tax-exempt allotment of 3 bales or less shall be permitted to sell tax free 3 bales of cotton. This section does not mean that all cotton farmers shall have the right to sell 3 bales tax free. It only applies to the 3-bale farmers. I am informed that in certain portions of Arkansas and in portions of other southern States the great majority of the cotton farmers in particular sections are so-called "3-bale farmers", or produce less than 3 bales. If this provision becomes a law, the number of 3-bale farmers will, in my opinion, greatly increase. The allotment of these States will be greatly increased. This will result in decreasing the allotment for Texas and especially west Texas. The average

farmer in the Nineteenth Congressional District is not a so-called "big planter", but he is by no means a 3-bale farmer. The farmer having an allotment of 5, 10, 20, or 30 bales will reap no benefit from this section of the Doxey bill, but, on the other hand, will be penalized and discriminated against. I think this provision is unwarranted and unwise and is destined to wreck the reduction program. There are many vicious evils in the Bankhead bill that ought to be remedied, but in this 3-bale exemption provision we are curing none of the evils and are discriminating against the biggest cotton-producing State in the Union.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FITZPATRICK, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAMNECK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. TONRY, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1386. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Duke E. Stubbs and Elizabeth S. Stubbs, both of McKinley Park, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5255. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 16, 1935:

H. R. 5221. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for other purposes.

On March 18, 1935:

H. R. 5255. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6772. A bill to amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity futures exchanges, to limit or abolish short selling, to curb manipulation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6453. A bill to amend the act of May 13, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande", and so forth, as amended by the public resolution of March 3, 1927; without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers in the United States Civil Service Department. (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 6732. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2024. A bill for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. S. 147. An act to alter the amount apportioned to certain States for public employment offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. S. 857. An act to authorize the Department of Labor to continue to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. S. 941. An act for the relief of William J. Cocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Mary Wyse Benson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Skeel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6793) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 6794) to provide for the payment of certain Creek equalization claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6795) to authorize the deportation of the habitual criminal, to guard against the separation from their families of aliens of the noncriminal classes, to provide for legalizing the residence in the United States of certain classes of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 6796) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 6797) to establish protective tariff on all importations of scallops; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENNINGS: A bill (H. R. 6798) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6799) to amend section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 6800) authorizing the construction of buildings for the United States High Commissioner to the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 6801) to provide for the construction of a post-office building in Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 6802) to provide for the manufacture of citrus-fruit brandy and the use of such brandy in the fortification of citrus wines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6803) to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control and protection against flood disasters; to the Committee on Flood control.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6804) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 6805) to provide for the appointment and promotion of substitute postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 6806) to provide for a loan committee in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pass on industrial loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) to authorize the Commissioner of Education in the Department of the Interior to conduct a study and disseminate his findings and recommendations regarding suitable aviation-instruction courses for the public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 6808) to apply the quota system to immigration from the Republic of Mexico and the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6809) to give the cotton farmer Government benefits on domestically consumed cotton without limiting production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6810) to provide for the national defense by promoting the development and improvement of military aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6811) to enforce the twenty-first amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 166) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2827, a bill to provide for the establishment of unemployment, old-age, and social insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) to authorize funds for work and work relief, to be used for the construction of homes for aged (public) pensioners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 219) extending the effective period of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SROVICH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 220) providing for the establishment of an executive department to be known as the "Department of Science, Art, and Literature"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of Porto Rico", approved December 21, 1928, as amended by the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1929, approved March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) to provide for the appointment of Gutzon Borglum as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, re the distribution of grain for seed purposes to needy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, re an antilynching law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, re the taxation of sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, re the construction of certain dams by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMLIE: A bill (H. R. 6812) for the relief of John Reinke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6813) for the relief of Jennie Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 6814) for the relief of the Eastern Shore of Virginia Produce Exchange, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6815) to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, to LaVantia H. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6816) for the relief of Andrew J. Wendling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 6817) to correct the military record of Charles B. Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6818) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to Thomas J. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to Lucy Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6821) for the relief of Alfred J. White and M. J. Banker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF: A bill (H. R. 6822) for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co., and George D. Mansfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6823) granting a pension to Laura B. Perley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 6824) granting an increase of pension to Christina M. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6825) for the relief of Mrs. Clarence J. McClary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHER: A bill (H. R. 6826) to correct the military record of Jonathan Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) granting 6 months' pay to George H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6829) authorizing a preliminary examination of Sebawaing River, in Huron County, Mich., with a view to the controlling of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4151. By Mr. AMLIE: Petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the adoption of the resolution providing that a General Pulaski Memorial Day be created; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4152. Also, petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the adoption of the Patman bill, providing for an immediate cash payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4153. Also, petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging that Congress request that Order No. 23709, of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, be vacated, inasmuch as this order, if permitted to stand, will, it is alleged, result in crippling or destroying organized labor; to the Committee on Labor.

4154. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of 23 citizens of Accomac County, requesting that Congress pass a uniform Federal old-age pension law that must be adopted by the States before any Federal aid or relief is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4155. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition signed by Henry Lahm and other residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of New York, opposing the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4156. Also, petition signed by Salvatore Citrano, of New York City, favoring the passage of the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4157. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of C. M. Ellingson, commander, and members of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, of Nielsville and vicinity in Minnesota, asking for passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4158. Also, petition of Mrs. Louis Rodal, unit secretary, in behalf of the members of the Nielsville (Minn.) Ladies Auxiliary Unit of American Legion Post, No. 336, Department of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4159. Also, petition of Clarence A. Oefstedal, commander, and Paul Taallerud, adjutant, of Fertile, Minn., of the Post No. 238 of the American Legion, in behalf of members of the post, praying for the passage of legislation to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4160. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition urging the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to work out a cattle program to provide for adjustment benefits to the end that parity prices may be obtained for cattle, and producers of cattle enabled to reestablish their almost depleted estates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4161. By Mr. BURNHAM: Petition of National Indian War Veterans, United States Army, by Joseph H. McKenna, San Diego, Calif., asking for the passage of the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1927"; to the Committee on Pensions.

4162. Also, resolution by the Townsend Old-Age Revolving-Pension Club, No. 33, of San Diego, Calif., urging Congress to immediately enact into law a bill (H. R. 3977) known as the "Townsend revolving-pension plan", to promote the general welfare, to assure permanent employment, and social security for all, and to stabilize business conditions through an assured definite and constant circulation of money and credit by the National Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4163. Also, resolution no. 1314, by the City Council of the City of Coronado, Calif., urging Congress to immediately enact into law a bill (H. R. 3977) known as the "Townsend revolving-pension plan", to promote the general welfare, to assure permanent employment and social security for all,

and to stabilize business conditions through an assured definite and constant circulation of money and credit by the National Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4164. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, State of California, urging Congress to remove all unwarranted obstacles to wine distribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4165. By Mr. CROWE: Petition of the Aurora Fish and Game Club of Aurora, Ind., by J. H. Trester, president, signed by 175 members and citizens of Aurora, urging the passage of the Crowe bill (H. J. 157), joint resolution to authorize a compact or agreement between Kentucky and Indiana with respect to hunting and fishing privileges, and other matters relating to jurisdiction on the Ohio River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4166. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Group No. 878, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, favoring enactment of House Joint Resolution 81; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4167. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Secretary of the Interior Ickes to appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in certain sections of the area contained within the third and fifth assembly districts, within the Thirteenth Senate District in the Borough of Manhattan, extending from Tenth Street to Sixty-third Street, west of Seventh and Eighth Avenues, and sections being commonly known as "Greenwich Village" and "Chelsea" on the west of Manhattan Borough; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4168. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, urging that the Secretary of the Interior appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in the Third and Fifth Assembly District in the Borough of Manhattan, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4169. By Mr. EKWALL: Petition of Group No. 549, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4170. By Mr. FOCHT: Resolution of J. R. Gearhart, of the Pennsylvania Dairymen's Association, urging import duty on registered dairy cattle from other countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4171. Also, resolution of the Mount Union Council of Junior Order United Americans, in regard to report submitted by special committee to the Secretary of Labor in reference to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4172. Also, resolution of the Mount Union Council of Junior Order United Americans, in regard to millions illegally residing in this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4173. By Mr. GINGERY: Petition of James J. Patterson, Post No. 813, Veterans of Foreign Wars, civic organizations, and citizens of Du Bois, Pa., requesting support of House bill 1, commonly known as the "Patman bill"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4174. By Mr. HOEPEL: Petition of the City Council of the City of Montebello, Calif., expressing support of the Townsend plan of old-age pensions and urging its enactment into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4175. Also, petition of business and professional men and women of Azusa, Calif., requesting that the McGroarty bill, embodying the Townsend old-age revolving-pension plan, be reported out of committee to the floor of the House for full and unhampered debate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4176. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petitions presented by Earl Irwin, John Colbe, Thomas Darling, Merrill F. Fitch, John J. Miller, F. P. Hutchins, and Ray Welker, containing signa-

tures of 242 persons, all residents of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, favoring enactment of the Frazier-Lemke bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4177. By Mr. HOOK: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Norway, Mich., as favoring legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4178. Also, resolution passed by the Common Council of the Village of Laurium, as going on record as favoring a strong national policy by the Government of the United States, and recommending and urging the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary and proper to effectively prohibit the importation of any foreign produced, raw or refined copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4179. Also, petition of Edward Ollila of Ironwood, Mich., and several other railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, asking assistance in protecting their rights as Wisconsin clerks to jobs rightfully theirs on trains running in and through Wisconsin, to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4180. Also, resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, asking for an appropriation to construct a Veterans' Administration hospital in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4181. Also, resolution adopted by the Houghton County, Mich., association of commerce as being opposed to legislation being enacted to make potatoes a basic commodity under the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4182. By Mr. KEE: Petition of citizens of the city of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 5262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4183. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Institute of Rural Economics of State of New Jersey, urging our President to use every effort to execute tariff and trade agreements which will maintain and increase foreign outlets for apples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4184. Also, petition of Sun-Ray Democratic Association, No. 1, of New York City, endorsing the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4185. Also, petition of Loggia Giuseppe Scarlata, No. 73, Ordine Indipendente Figli D'Italia, of Corona, Long Island, New York City, heartily endorsing the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4186. Also, petition of Jack Ingegneros Democratic Association, No. 1, of New York City, urging adoption of the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4187. Also, resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Jersey Chick Association, favoring House bill 5802; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4188. Also, resolutions adopted by the Institute of Rural Economics of the State of New Jersey, favoring support of the President in maintaining wage scales on relief projects slightly less than those prevailing in the community; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4189. Also, resolutions adopted by the Institute of Rural Economics of the State of New Jersey, favoring our National Government to adopt a more consistent policy directed toward the establishment of a prosperous agriculture in this country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4190. By Mr. LAMNECK: Resolution of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the wage-schedule provision passed by the Senate under what is known as the "McCarran amendment"; to the Committee on Labor.

4191. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., respectfully petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4192. Also, resolution of members of the American Yugoslav Educational League, being directly or indirectly dependent upon copper mining for a living, petitioning the Congress of the United States to sustain the present excise tax on

copper and to increase same to 8 cents per pound or to put an embargo on all foreign copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4193. Also, resolution of Calumet Business Men's Association, Calumet, Mich., petitioning, urging, and recommending the enactment of legislation to effectively prohibit the importation of any foreign-produced raw or refined copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4194. Also, resolution of the executive board of the Slovenic-Croatian Union, a fraternal organization at Calumet, Mich., urging and recommending the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation of any foreign-produced copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4195. Also, resolution of International Workers' Order, Branch 2088, Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827) in the interest of the toiling masses of the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

4196. Also, resolution of the Slovak Evangelical Union, No. 218, urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

4197. Also, resolution of the Evangelical Slovak Women's Union of Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

4198. Also, resolution of the Michigan Federation of Labor, urging and favoring legislation and regulation limiting the length, weight, and speed of commercial vehicles using the public highways and also limiting the hours of service of the drivers of such vehicles so as to protect the safety of the general public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4199. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Los Angeles City Council, relative to the immediate establishment of a national civil academy, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

4200. Also, resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Englewood, relative to legislation on un-American activities, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4201. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, Waterfront Unemployed Council, American League of Ex-Servicemen, urging that Congress enact pending legislation to pay immediately the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4202. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of Vernon B. Walters and 10 other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bills (H. R. 5423 and S. 1725); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4203. Also, petition of Kathryn Hinnenkamp and 10 other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4204. Also, petition of Thomas J. Coffey and sundry residents of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., urging Congress to defeat the Rayburn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4205. Also, petition of Warren B. Sheldon and sundry residents of Brooklyn and New York City, appealing to Congress to defeat the passage of the Rayburn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4206. Also, resolution of the World Trade League of the United States, Inc., New York City, N. Y., heartily supporting the efforts of the Government under the able direction of Secretary of State Hull and his collaborators to accord in reciprocal trade agreements, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4207. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias Roman Catholic Church, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4208. By Mr. MILLARD: Resolution adopted by the Father Edward F. O'Sullivan Council, Knights of Columbus, Harrison, N. Y., protesting certain activities of the National Revolutionary Party in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4209. Also, resolution adopted by the Architectural and Engineering Alliance, of White Plains, N. Y., urging the enactment of the so-called "Hayden highway amendment" to House Joint Resolution 117; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4210. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Kings County Pattern & Model Works, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 4027; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4211. Also, petition of the Kings and Queens Counties Roofers and Sheet Metal Contractors Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning amendment to work relief bill whereby private contractors will be permitted to participate and bid on proposed projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4212. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 89, Senate of the State of New York, Albany, urging the Secretary of the Interior appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in Greenwich Village and Chelsea sections of Manhattan, from Tenth to Sixty-third Streets, west of Seventh and Eighth Avenues; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4213. Also, petition of Piel Bros., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging defeat of Senate bill 626 and House bill 5851; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4214. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, concerning the public utility bills of 1935 (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4215. Also, petition of the Bellis Wire Works, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning House bill 4027; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4216. Also, petition of the East Brooklyn Savings & Loan Associations, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning discrimination against State-chartered savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4217. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Detroit Fire Department Post, No. 1339, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4218. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 6, Senate of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4219. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 5, Senate of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass suitable legislation or the Postmaster General take suitable action to deed to the State of Michigan the old post-office site and building in Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

4220. Also, Resolution 13006, of the Common Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4221. Also, resolution of the United Racial Groups of America, favoring old-age pension laws be approved and made applicable to noncitizens as well as citizens, providing that such noncitizens be residents of the United States for not less than 10 years prior to the passage of such legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4222. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition of A. Tolman and numerous other citizens of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4223. Also, petition of W. A. Norman and numerous other citizens of Brownwood, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4224. Also, petition of E. Craig and numerous other citizens of Baytown, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Con-

gressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4225. Also, petition of G. Smith and numerous other citizens of Center, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4226. Also, petition of Vernon Furlow and numerous other citizens of Alvord, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4227. Also, petition of G. C. Huffman and numerous other citizens of Lingleville, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4228. Also, petition of H. C. Subers and numerous other citizens of Eastland, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4229. Also, petition of L. Sikes and numerous other citizens of Huffman, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4230. Also, petition of A. Hollingsworth and numerous other citizens of Cooter, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4231. Also, petition of A. Bowens and numerous other citizens of Blytheville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4232. Also, petition of M. Burnett and numerous other citizens of Hooks, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4233. Also, petition of John Norfleet and numerous other citizens of Fort Worth, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4234. Also, petition of John Roberts and numerous other citizens of New Boston, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4235. Also, petition of C. H. Webster and numerous other citizens of the county of McCurtain, in the State of Oklahoma, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4236. Also, petition of J. W. Bearden and numerous other citizens of Wright City, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4237. Also, petition of B. L. McPhearson and numerous other citizens of Conway, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4238. Also, petition of W. J. Stone and numerous other citizens of Vilonia, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4239. Also, petition of C. J. Vaughn and numerous other citizens of Royston, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal

old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4240. Also, petition of G. S. Drake and numerous other citizens of Comer, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4241. Also, petition of O. L. Osley and numerous other citizens of Bowman, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4242. Also, petition of C. H. Frye and numerous other citizens of Pinnacle, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4243. Also, petition of G. B. Rockett and numerous other citizens of Winston-Salem, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4244. Also, petition of W. L. Dobbins and numerous other citizens of Yackinville, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4245. Also, petition of C. R. Reeves and numerous other citizens of the county of Amite, in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4246. Also, petition of Lawrence Westbrook and numerous other citizens of Smithdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4247. Also, petition of C. A. Voyles, and numerous other citizens of Birch, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4248. Also, petition of J. A. Williamson and numerous other citizens of Persimmon Creek, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4249. Also, petition of L. H. Picklesimon and numerous other citizens of Suit, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4250. Also, petition of John W. Keenum and numerous other citizens of Vests, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4251. Also, petition of Andrew Gregory and numerous other citizens of Brinkley, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4252. Also, petition of Ambrose Wynne and numerous other citizens of Fargo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4253. Also, petition of Sylvester Roach and numerous other citizens of the county of Mobile in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4254. Also, petition of John Trotter and numerous other citizens of Mobile, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-

age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4255. Also, petition of L. D. McClonid and numerous other citizens of Magee, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4256. Also, petition of Frederick Jones and numerous other citizens of Weathersby, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4257. Also, petition of Washington Hays and numerous other citizens of Mendenhall, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4258. Also, petition of James Hayes and numerous other citizens of the county of East Feliciana in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4259. Also, petition of Alex Evans, Sr., and numerous other citizens of Slaughter, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4260. Also, petition of W. Hicks, and numerous other citizens of Dundee, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4261. Also, petition of J. H. Wilson and numerous other citizens of Hartford, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4262. Also, petition of R. Reed and numerous other citizens of the county of Covington in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4263. Also, petition of Andrew Pierrie and numerous other citizens of Falsom, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4264. Also, petition of W. D. Beaner and numerous other citizens of the county of Cherokee in the State of South Carolina, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4265. Also, petition of R. J. Campbell and numerous other citizens of Gaffney, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4266. Also, petition of M. J. Freeman and numerous other citizens of Chattahoochee, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4267. Also, petition of Joseph Braxton and numerous other citizens of Tallahassee, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4268. Also, petition of M. D. Wade and numerous other citizens of Sneads, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4269. Also, petition of L. Glover and numerous other citizens of St. Joseph, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal

old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4270. Also, petition of Spencer Washington and numerous other citizens of Apalachicola, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4271. Also, petition of Lester Woods and numerous other citizens of the county of Jefferson in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4272. Also, petition of Charles Hill and numerous other citizens of Bessemer, Ala., favoring House bill H. R. 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4273. Also, petition of W. A. Jeffres and numerous other citizens of the county of Union in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4274. Also, petition of J. A. Lowery and numerous other citizens of El Dorado, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4275. Also, petition of Frank McFall and numerous other citizens of the county of Pearl River in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4276. Also, petition of C. S. Green and numerous other citizens of Millard, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4277. Also, petition of C. R. Allen and numerous other citizens of the county of Newton in the State of Georgia, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4278. Also, petition of Raymond Shodix and numerous other citizens of Covington, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4279. Also, petition of G. McDaniel and numerous other citizens of the county of McCormick in the State of South Carolina, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4280. Also, petition of the Rev. J. W. Elmore and numerous other citizens of Troy, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4281. Also, petition of D. Evans and numerous other citizens of the county of Grimes in the State of Texas, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4282. Also, petition of Julius Paulhill and numerous other citizens of Singleton, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4283. Also, petition of Henry Floyd and numerous other citizens of the county of Crittenden in the State of Arkansas, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4284. Also, petition of Percy Marsh and numerous other citizens of Earl, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age

pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4285. Also, petition of O. Alexander and numerous other citizens of Jacksonville, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4286. Also, petition of M. P. Bobbitt and numerous other citizens of Ponta, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4287. Also, petition of William Taylor and numerous other citizens of the county of Alexander in the State of Illinois, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4288. Also, petition of Robert Griffin and numerous other citizens of Cairo, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pension of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4289. Also, petition of M. May and numerous other citizens of Oakley, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pension of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4290. Also, petition of B. B. Duncan and numerous other citizens of Madisonville, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4291. Also, petition of M. Y. Swope and numerous other citizens of Maniton, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4292. Also, petition of Gus Wiship and numerous other citizens of Dunnellon, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4293. Also, petition of Henry Ivory and numerous other citizens of the county of Brundidge in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4294. Also, petition of Calvin Jones and numerous other citizens of Brundidge, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4295. Also, petition of E. D. Green and numerous other citizens of Enterprise, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4296. Also, petition of Voltaire Baptiste and numerous other citizens of the county of Iberville in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4297. Also, petition of Isac Baptiste and numerous other citizens of White Castle, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4298. Also, petition of A. Gibbs and other citizens of Goldonna, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4299. Also, petition of F. M. Walker and numerous other citizens of Dry Prong, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal

old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4300. Also, petition of V. O. Roberts and numerous other citizens of the county of Roosevelt, in the State of New Mexico, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4301. Also, petition of I. O. Harris and numerous other citizens of Portales, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4302. Also, petition of A. G. Ammons and numerous other citizens of Prescott, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4303. Also, petition of H. J. Tompkins and numerous other citizens of Waldo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4304. Also, petition of A. Z. Shipp and numerous other citizens of Rosston, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4305. Also, petition of J. S. Benson and numerous other citizens of Oakland, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4306. Also, petition of Merret M. Phillips and numerous other citizens of Montgomery, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4307. Also, petition of Charley Calcote and numerous other citizens of Hamburg, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4308. Also, petition of Monroe Johnson and numerous other citizens of Leesdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4309. Also, petition of Jeff McGill and numerous other citizens of the county of Marion in the State of Florida, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4310. Also, petition of A. G. Fleming and numerous other citizens of the county of Coffee in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4311. Also, petition of Anderson Tellie and numerous other citizens of the county of Yalobusha in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4312. Also, petition of R. S. Canterbury and numerous other citizens of the county of Montgomery in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4313. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of Rolfe E. Rowe, town clerk, Bristol, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4314. By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Resolution adopted by the City Council of Bristol, Conn., memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11, General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4315. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Edith Obetz and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seri-

ously harmed if either of the public-utility bills introduced in Congress February 6, 1935, becomes a law, as these bills are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4316. Also, petition of F. E. Bussdieker and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging Congress to pass the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4317. Also, petition of J. C. Sloan and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging the Government of the United States to pass a bill obligating itself to pay every citizen of said Government, whose record is free of habitual criminality and who has attained the age of 60 years, a monthly pension of \$200 until the end of his life upon the sole condition that he agree, under oath, to spend the entire amount of the pension within the confines of the United States during the current month in which it is received; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4318. Also, petition of Gertrude S. Cook and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seriously harmed if either of the public-utility bills introduced in Congress February 6, 1935, becomes a law, as these bills are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4319. Also, petition of the Newburg Branch of the Townsend Old-Age Pensions Organization, by their president, James H. Rose, and secretary, Hugh E. Smith, Cleveland, Ohio, urging Congressman TRUX to sign the petition to bring the McGroarty bill out of committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4320. By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, urging the Congress of the United States to give early and favorable consideration to such legislation as will bring about the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4321. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of City Council of Brockton, Mass., urging Congress to enact legislation that will permit of the paying of workingmen's compensation to any person suffering injuries or death while working on Emergency Relief Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4322. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Roosevelt League of the city of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Labor.

4323. Also, petition of the city of Gillespie, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4324. Also, petition of the village of Roseville, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4325. Also, petition of the city of Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4326. Also, petition of La Jolla Townsend Club, La Jolla, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4327. Also, petition of the Golden Hill Townsend Club No. 53, San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4328. Also, petition of the Five Point Branch, Unemployment Council, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor.

4329. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society, of the city of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4330. Also, petition of the code administrative agency of western Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Labor.

4331. Also, petition of the Idaho State Association of Bank Depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4332. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition containing 40 names protesting against enactment of the holding-company bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4333. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition signed by W. J. Donais and 92 other residents of Merrimac, Mass., and vicinity, favoring the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4334. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to enact tariffs to protect the agricultural industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4335. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mabel Evans of Akron, Mich., and 27 other resident of Tuscola County,

Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4336. By Mr. BERLIN: Petition of Groups Nos. 124 and 65, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, with local headquarters at East Vandergrift and New Kensington, Pa., respectively, that House Joint Resolution No. 81 or Senate Joint Resolution No. 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, be enacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4337. Also a petition of the Council of the City of Monessen, Pa., urging that the Congress of the United States pass, and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 18, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report, submitted pursuant to law, of the American War Mothers for the year ended October 1, 1934, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

I, Enrique Gonzalez Mena, secretary of the Senate of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the following resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate of Puerto Rico on March 11, 1935:

"Resolution to request His Excellency the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the Honorable Santiago Iglesias, that approval be given to the legislation introduced in the Congress of the United States amending the organic act of Puerto Rico in the sense that the municipal bond issues to carry out self-liquidating projects be not charged against the borrowing capacity of the municipalities, and for other purposes

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, providing an amendment to the effect that the bond issues of the municipalities of Puerto Rico to carry out self-liquidating projects be not charged against their borrowing capacity;

"Whereas such legislative measure, if definitely approved, would redound to the great benefit of the municipalities of Puerto Rico and would be of great use in improving the economic conditions thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico, First: To request from His Excellency the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the Honorable Santiago Iglesias, the approval of the legislation introduced in the Congress of the United States amending